

Applications of iterated curve blowup to set theoretic complete intersections in $\mathbb{P}^3$

David B. Jaffe*

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Nebraska
Lincoln, NE 68588-0323, USA (jaffe@cphree.unl.edu)

Contents

Introduction	2
Conventions	5
 I Local geometry of smooth curves on singular surfaces	
1 Definitions	6
2 The type of a surface-curve pair	8
3 Examples	12
4 Classification of rational double point pairs	15
5 Invariants of rational double point configurations	15
6 Technical lemmas on rational double points	23
 II Iterated curve blowups	
7 Intersection ring of a blow up	28
8 The intersection ring of an iterated curve blow-up	29
9 The strict transform of a ruling	33
 III Application to set-theoretic complete intersections	
10 Theorems I and II	38
11 Theorems III, Q, and B	42
12 Theorem A	47
13 Theorem X	49
 References	54

*Partially supported by the National Science Foundation.

Introduction

We describe some new results on the set-theoretic complete intersection problem for projective space curves. Fix an algebraically closed ground field k . Let $S, T \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ be surfaces. Suppose that $S \cap T$ is set-theoretically a smooth curve C of degree d and genus g . For purposes of the introduction, we label the main results as A, B, Q, X, I, II, and III.¹ The results I, II, and III are more technical than A, B, Q, and X.

Suppose that S and T have no common singular points. We discover that this requirement imposes severe limitations. Indeed, theorem (X) asserts that if C is not a complete intersection, then $\deg(S), \deg(T) < 2d^4$. Fixing (d, g) , one can in fact form a finite list of all possible pairs $(\deg(S), \deg(T))$, which is much shorter than the list implied by theorem (X). For instance, when $(d, g) = (4, 0)$, and assuming for simplicity that $\deg(S) \leq \deg(T)$, we find that

$$(\deg(S), \deg(T)) \in \{(3, 4), (3, 8), (4, 4), (4, 7), (6, 26), (9, 48), (10, 28),$$

$$(12, 18), (13, 16), (17, 220), (18, 118), (19, 84), (20, 67), (22, 50), (28, 33)\}.$$

Very little is known about which of these degree pairs actually correspond to surface pairs (S, T) .

Suppose that S and T have only rational singularities, and that the ground field k has characteristic zero. We continue to assume that S and T have no common singular points. Under these conditions, we prove (A) that $d \leq g + 3$. (The actual statement is somewhat stronger.)

Suppose that S is normal, and that $d > \deg(S)$. Make no assumptions about how the singularities of S and T meet. Assume that $\text{char}(k) = 0$. We show (Q) that C is linearly normal. In particular, it follows by Riemann-Roch that $d \leq g + 3$.

Suppose that S is a quartic surface having only rational singularities. Allow T to be an arbitrary surface, and make no assumptions about how the singularities of S and T meet. Assume that $\text{char}(k) = 0$. Under these conditions, we prove (B) that C is linearly normal.

In other papers [17], [18], we have proved the following complementary results (in characteristic zero): if S has only ordinary nodes as singularities,

¹The actual numbering in the text is A = 12.2, B = 11.11, Q = 11.8, X = 13.1, I = 10.1, II = 10.3, III = 11.1.

or is a cone, or has degree ≤ 3 , then $d \leq g + 3$. It is conceivable (in characteristic zero) that this inequality is valid without any restrictions whatsoever on S and T , or even that C is always linearly normal. Examples of smooth set-theoretic complete intersection curves in $\mathbb{CP}^3$ have been constructed by Gallarati [8], Catanese [3], Rao ([27] prop. 14), and the author [19].

To explain the results (I), (II), and (III), and to describe the methods by which we prove (A), (B), and (X), there are two key ideas which must be discussed.² Both of these ideas have to do with the iterated blowing up of curves.

The first idea has to do with certain invariants $p_i = p_i(S, C)$ ($i \in \mathbb{N}$) which we associate to a pair (S, C) consisting of an abstract surface S and a smooth curve C on S such that $C \not\subset \text{Sing}(S)$. Let $\pi : \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ be the blowup along C . Then $p_1(S, C)$ is the sum of the multiplicities of the exceptional curves. (See §2 for details.) Moreover, π admits a unique section $\tilde{C}$ over C , so we can define $p_2(S, C) = p_1(\tilde{S}, \tilde{C})$, $p_3(S, C) = p_2(\tilde{S}, \tilde{C})$, and so forth. We refer to the sequence $(p_1, p_2, \dots)$ as the *type* of (S, C) . It is a sum of local contributions, one for each singular point of S along C , and it is a rather mysterious measure of how singular S is along C . The type depends not only on the particular species of singular points of S which lie on C , but also on the way in which C passes through those points. For example, the local contribution to the type coming from an A_3 singularity is either $(1, 1, 1, 0, \dots)$ or $(2, 0, \dots)$, depending on how C passes through the singular point.

The second idea is the following construction. For this we assume (as in the first paragraph) that $C = S \cap T$ (in $\mathbb{P}^3$) and that $C \not\subset \text{Sing}(S)$, $C \not\subset \text{Sing}(T)$. Other than this, no restrictions are necessary on the singularities of S and T . Let Y_1 denote the blowup of $\mathbb{P}^3$ along C . Let $S_1, T_1 \subset Y_1$ denote the strict transforms of S and T respectively. Let $E_1 \subset Y_1$ be the exceptional divisor, which is a ruled surface over $\mathbb{C}$. Then $S_1 \cap E_1$ is a curve C_1 (mapping isomorphically onto C), together with some rulings. The total number of rulings, counted with multiplicities, is $p_1(S, C)$. Now let Y_2 be the blowup of Y_1 along C_1 . Let $S_2, T_2, E_2 \subset Y_2$ be as above. Then $S_2 \cap E_2$ is a curve C_2 plus $p_2(S, C)$ rulings. Iterate this construction n times, where n is the multiplicity of intersection of S and T along C . Then $S_n \cap T_n$ is a union of strict transforms of rulings. This fact leads us to theorems (I) and (II), which are statements about the numbers p_i . Theorem (III) is also

²We also give an alternate proof of the key ingredient of (X), which is independent of the main machine of this paper.

such a statement, but it does not depend on the construction we have just described.

We describe theorems (I), (II), and (III). These depend on the data (s, t, d, g) , where $s = \deg(S)$, $t = \deg(T)$. To make this description as simple as possible, we restrict our attention here to the special case where $(s, t, d, g) = (4, 4, 4, 0)$.

Theorem (I) has the hypothesis that $\text{Sing}(S) \cap \text{Sing}(T) = \emptyset$. Its conclusion (applied to our special case) is that:

$$p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = 8.$$

Theorem (I) is used in the proofs of (A) and (X).

Theorem (II) has no additional hypotheses. Its conclusion (applied to our special case) is that:

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 &\geq 8; \\ 2p_1 + p_2 &\geq 24; \\ 8p_1 + 3p_2 + p_3 &\geq 96. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem (II) is not used in the proofs of (A) or (B).

Theorem (III) has the hypotheses that S has only rational singularities, and that $\text{char}(k) = 0$. Its conclusion (applied to our special case) is that:

$$\frac{1}{2}p_1 + \frac{1}{6}p_2 + \frac{1}{12}p_3 + \cdots + \frac{1}{k(k+1)}p_k + \cdots \geq 6.$$

Theorem (III), or actually a minor variant of it, is used in the proof of (B).

We now mention some open problems and possible ways to improve upon the results in this paper.

- 1.** Let (S, C) be the local scheme S of a normal surface singularity, together with a smooth curve C on S . There are three fundamental invariants of (S, C) which are utilized in this paper. Firstly, there is the type of (S, C) . Secondly, there is the order of (S, C) , i.e. the smallest positive integer n such that $\mathcal{O}_S(nC)$ is Cartier. Thirdly, there is $\Delta(S, C)$, which we describe in §1. What relationships exist between these three invariants? What is their relationship to the Milnor fiber?
- 2.** We suspect that (A), (B), and (III) are valid over an arbitrary algebraically closed field. There are significant difficulties in proving this which we have not explored fully. The proofs of (I) and (II) do not depend on the characteristic.

3. The proofs of (A) and (B) use a bound (11.3) on the number of exceptional curves in a minimal resolution for a surface $S \subset \mathbb{CP}^3$ having only rational singularities. Formulate and prove a suitable generalization for arbitrary normal surfaces.
4. Construct examples of surfaces $S, T \subset \mathbb{CP}^3$, having only rational singularities, meeting set-theoretically along a smooth curve C , such that $\text{Sing}(S) \cap \text{Sing}(T) \neq \emptyset$. The only example we know of is where $\deg(S) = \deg(T) = 2$, and C is a line.
5. The generic hypothesis that $C \not\subset \text{Sing}(T)$ can probably be eliminated.

Acknowledgements. I thank Dave Morrison for helpful comments, and Juan Migliore for raising the issue of linear normality of set-theoretic complete intersections.

Conventions

- (1) We fix an algebraically closed field k .
- (2) A *curve* [resp. *surface*] [resp. *three-fold*] is an excellent k -scheme such that every maximal chain of irreducible proper closed subsets has length one [resp. two] [resp. three]. We make the following additional assumptions:
 - all curves are reduced and irreducible;
 - in part III and the introduction, all surfaces are reduced and irreducible.
- (3) A surface *embeds in codimension one* if it can be exhibited as an effective Cartier divisor on a regular three-fold.
- (4) A *variety* is an integral separated scheme of finite-type over k .
- (5) If X and Y are schemes, then the notation $X \subset Y$ carries the implicit assumption that X is a *closed subscheme* of Y .
- (6) In several situations, we use *bracketed exponents* to denote *repetition* in sequences, and we drop trailing zeros, where appropriate. For example,

$$(2, 1^{[4]}) = (2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, \dots)$$

and

$$(3^{[\infty]}) = (3, 3, \dots).$$

- (7) We use the Grothendieck convention regarding projective space bundles.
- (8) For any variety V , we let $A^k(V)$ denote the group of codimension k cycles on V , modulo *algebraic* equivalence. When $d = \dim(V)$ and V is complete, we identify $A^d(V)$ with $\mathbb{Z}$.

Part I

Local geometry of smooth curves on singular surfaces

1 Definitions

We define the category of *surface-curve pairs*. (Sometimes, we use the shorthand term *pair* for a surface-curve pair.) An *object* (S, C) in this category consists of a surface S , together with a curve $C \subset S$, such that C is a regular scheme and $C \not\subset \text{Sing}(S)$. A *morphism* $f : (S', C') \rightarrow (S, C)$ is a pair $(S' \rightarrow S, C' \rightarrow C)$ of morphisms of k -schemes, such that the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C' & \longrightarrow & C \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ S' & \longrightarrow & S \end{array}$$

commutes, and such that if $\phi : C' \rightarrow C \times_S S'$ is the induced map, then $\phi \times_S \text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{S,C}$ is an isomorphism. Such a morphism f is *cartesian* if ϕ is an isomorphism. Most properties of morphisms of schemes also make sense as properties of morphisms in this category: the properties are to be interpreted as properties of the morphism $S' \rightarrow S$.

Let (S, C) be a surface-curve pair. We say that:

- (S, C) is *geometric* if S is a variety;
- (S, C) is *local* if S is a local scheme;

- (S, C) is *local-geometric* if S is a local scheme, essentially of finite type over k .

To give a local surface-curve pair (S, C) is equivalent to giving the data $(A, \mathfrak{p})$, consisting of an excellent local k -algebra A , of pure dimension two, together with a height one prime $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$ such that $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $A/\mathfrak{p}$ are regular. We write $(S, C) = \text{Spec}(A, \mathfrak{p})$ to denote this correspondence.

There are two operations on surface-curve pairs which we will be using. Firstly, if (S, C) is a local surface-curve pair, then the *completion* $(\hat{S}, \hat{C})$ makes sense and is also a local surface-curve pair. Indeed, if $(S, C) = \text{Spec}(A, \mathfrak{p})$, then $A/\mathfrak{p}$ is regular, and so $\hat{A}/\hat{\mathfrak{p}}$ is regular, since it equals $\widehat{A/\mathfrak{p}}$, and the completion of a regular local ring is regular. The reader may also check easily that $\hat{A}_{\hat{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is regular. Moreover, $\hat{A}$ is excellent, since any noetherian complete local ring is excellent. Note also: there is a canonical morphism $(S, C) \rightarrow (\hat{S}, \hat{C})$.

Secondly, for any surface-curve pair (S, C) , one can define the *blowup* $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{C})$ of (S, C) . This is done by letting $\pi: \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ be the blowup of S along C , and by letting $\tilde{C}$ be the unique section of π over C , which exists e.g. by ([11] 7.3.5). There is a canonical morphism $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{C}) \rightarrow (S, C)$.

Two local surface-curve pairs are *analytically isomorphic* if their completions are isomorphic.

If (S, C) is a surface-curve pair, and $p \in C$, we let $(S, C)_p$ denote the corresponding local surface-curve pair. A *configuration* is an element of the free abelian monoid on the set of analytic isomorphism classes of local-geometric pairs.

Let (S, C) be a geometric surface-curve pair. We may associate the configuration:

$$\sum_{p \in \text{Sing}(S) \cap C} [(S, C)_p]$$

to (S, C) . On occasion, we shall identify (S, C) with the associated configuration.

We are interested in invariants of a geometric surface-curve pair (S, C) which depend only on the associated configuration. There are four such invariants which we shall consider:

- (1) The *order* of (S, C) is the smallest $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{O}_S(nC)$ is Cartier, or else ∞ if $\mathcal{O}_S(nC)$ is not Cartier for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\text{Sing}(S) \cap C =$

$\{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$, then

$$\text{order}(S, C) = \text{lcm} \{ \text{order}(S, C)_{p_1}, \dots, \text{order}(S, C)_{p_k} \},$$

so the computation of the order is a purely local problem. Moreover, at least if S is normal, the order depends only on the associated configuration. Indeed, in that case, if (S, C) is a local-geometric pair, then S is excellent, so $\hat{S}$ is normal, and so by ([6] 6.12) one knows that the canonical map $\text{Cl}(S) \rightarrow \text{Cl}(\hat{S})$ is injective. Hence $\text{order}(S, C) = \text{order}(\hat{S}, \hat{C})$.

- (2) The *type* of (S, C) , which is the sequence $(p_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ discussed in the introduction, and studied in §2.
- (3) Assume that S is normal. We define an invariant $\Delta(S, C) \in \mathbb{Q}$. Let $\pi : \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ be a minimal resolution, and let $E_1, \dots, E_n \subset \tilde{S}$ be the exceptional curves. Let $\tilde{C} \subset \tilde{S}$ be the strict transform of C . According to ([26] p. 241), there is a unique $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor $E = \sum a_i E_i$ such that $(\tilde{C} + E) \cdot E_i = 0$ for all i . We define $\Delta(S, C) = -E^2$. Then $\Delta(S, C)$ is independent of π . If S is projective, then $\Delta(S, C) = C^2 - \tilde{C}^2$, where C^2 is defined in ([26] p. 241).
- (4) Assume that S has only rational double points along C . Let $\Sigma(S, C)$ equal the number of exceptional curves in the minimal resolution of those singularities of S which lie on C .

2 The type of a surface-curve pair

We define the *type* of a surface-curve pair, and show that it is an analytic invariant, at least when the surface embeds in codimension one.

Definition. Let (S, C) be a surface-curve pair. Let $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{C})$ be the blowup of (S, C) . Let $E_1, \dots, E_n \subset \tilde{S}$ be the (reduced) exceptional curves. We define numbers $p_i(S, C)$, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Define:

$$p_1(S, C) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{length } \mathcal{O}_{\pi^{-1}(C), E_i},$$

where $\pi : \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ is the blowup map. For $i \geq 2$, recursively define $p_i(S, C)$ by:

$$p_{i+1}(S, C) = p_i(\tilde{S}, \tilde{C}).$$

The *type* of (S, C) is the sequence $(p_1, p_2, \dots)$.

It is clear that the computation of the p_i may be reduced to the computation of the p_i when (S, C) is a local pair.

Remark 2.1 Let (S, C) be a surface-curve pair, and assume that S embeds in codimension one. Then we have $S \subset T$ for some smooth three-fold T . Let $\pi_S : \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ and $\pi_T : \tilde{T} \rightarrow T$ be the blowups of S and T along C . Then $\pi_S^{-1}(C) \cong \tilde{S} \cap E$, where $E \subset \tilde{T}$ is the exceptional divisor. This fact plays an absolutely central role in our type computations.

Remark 2.2 We do not know for which (S, C) we have $p_1(S, C) \geq p_2(S, C)$, and hence that $p_k(S, C) \geq p_{k+1}(S, C)$ for all $k \geq 1$. Conceivably, these inequalities may hold whenever S embeds in codimension one, or even whenever S is Cohen-Macaulay. By explicit calculation, we shall find in (5.2) that the inequalities hold if S has only rational double points along C . However, as (3.2) shows, for some (S, C) one has $p_1(S, C) < p_2(S, C)$.

Remark 2.3 We consider the following general question. Let (S, C) be a local-geometric pair. Assume that S is not smooth. Let $p \in S$ be the closed point. Let $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{C})$ be the blowup of S along C . Let $\pi : \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ be the blowup map. What is the structure of $X = \pi^{-1}(p)_{\text{red}}$? If S embeds in codimension one, then X will be a $\mathbb{P}^1$. Weird things can happen if S is not Cohen-Macaulay. For example, in (3.2), X is isomorphic to $\text{Proj } \mathbb{C}[s, t, u]/(s^3 - t^2u)$, which is a rational curve with a cusp. In (3.3), X is the disjoint union of a point and several copies of $\mathbb{P}^1$, which do not meet $\tilde{C}$. The isolated point of X is the unique point of $\tilde{C}$ lying over p . Assuming only that S is Cohen-Macaulay, we do not know if X is always isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^1$, or even if it is always connected. However: if S embeds in codimension two, then X embeds in $\mathbb{P}^2$.

We will prove (2.9) that the type of a local-geometric pair (S, C) is an analytic invariant, provided that S embeds in codimension one. There are some preliminaries.

Lemma 2.4 *Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a flat, formally smooth homomorphism of Artin local rings. Assume that A contains a field. Then $\text{length}(A) = \text{length}(B)$.*

PROOF. Let K and L be the residue fields of A and B . Let $i : K \rightarrow L$ be the induced map. Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the maximal ideal of A . Then the map $K = A/\mathfrak{m} \rightarrow B/\mathfrak{m}B$ is formally smooth, so $B/\mathfrak{m}B = L$ and so i is formally smooth. A theorem of Cohen ([23] 28.J) implies that A contains a coefficient field, which we also denote by K . Since i is formally smooth, L/K is a separable field extension. It follows by the cited theorem that we may find a coefficient field L for B which contains $f(K)$.

Let $\overline{A} = A \otimes_K L$. Then f factors as:

$$A \xrightarrow{h} \overline{A} \xrightarrow{g} B.$$

Since i is formally smooth, so is h . Since both h and $g \circ h$ are formally smooth it follows by ([12] 17.1.4) that g is formally smooth.

Clearly B is a finite $\overline{A}$ -module. In particular, g is of finite-type, so g is smooth. Since g is smooth of relative dimension zero, g is étale. By ([12] 18.1.2), the obvious functor:

$$\ll \text{étale } \overline{A}\text{-schemes} \gg \longrightarrow \ll \text{étale } L\text{-schemes} \gg$$

is an equivalence of categories, so g is an isomorphism. Hence $B \cong A \otimes_K L$. Hence $\text{length}(A) = \text{length}(B)$. f

Corollary 2.5 *Let $f : X' \rightarrow X$ be a flat, formally smooth morphism of irreducible noetherian schemes. Assume that X is defined over a field. Let η and η' be the generic points of X and X' . Then:*

$$\text{length } \mathcal{O}_{X', \eta'} = \text{length } \mathcal{O}_{X, \eta}.$$

Remark 2.6 We do not know if (2.4) and (2.5) are true without the hypothesis of being “defined over a field”.

Lemma 2.7 *Let $f : (S_1, C_1) \rightarrow (S_2, C_2)$ be a flat morphism of surface-curve pairs. Then f is cartesian.*

PROOF. We must show that the induced map $\phi : C_1 \rightarrow C_2 \times_{S_1} S_2$ is an isomorphism. It suffices to show that $C_1 = C_2 \times_{S_1} S_2$ as closed subschemes of S_2 . Let $\pi : C_2 \times_{S_1} S_2 \rightarrow C_2$ be the projection map. Because π is flat, any irreducible component of $C_2 \times_{S_1} S_2$ must dominate C_2 . (See e.g. [14] III 9.7.) But $\phi \times_{S_2} \text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{S_2, C_2}$ is an isomorphism, so it follows that $C_2 \times_{S_1} S_2$ is irreducible. Since $C_1 = C_2 \times_{S_1} S_2$ at their generic points, they are equal as closed subschemes of S_2 . f

Proposition 2.8 *Let $f : (S_1, C_1) \rightarrow (S_2, C_2)$ be a formally smooth, flat morphism of surface-curve pairs. Assume that the induced map $C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ is bijective. Assume that S_1 and S_2 embed in codimension one. Then (S_1, C_1) and (S_2, C_2) have the same type.*

PROOF. The subscript i will always vary through the set $\{1, 2\}$. Because of our hypothesis on the map $C_1 \rightarrow C_2$, we may assume that S_1, S_2 are local schemes and that f is a local morphism. Let $\pi_i : (\tilde{S}_i, \tilde{C}_i) \rightarrow (S_i, C_i)$ be the blowup maps. By the universal property of blowing up, and because f is cartesian by (2.7), we obtain a map $\tilde{f} : \tilde{S}_1 \rightarrow \tilde{S}_2$ which makes the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{S}_1 & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} & \tilde{S}_2 \\ \downarrow \pi_1 & & \downarrow \pi_2 \\ S_1 & \xrightarrow{f} & S_2 \end{array}$$

commute. Furthermore, using the flatness of f , we see that this diagram is cartesian and as a consequence that $\tilde{f}$ is flat and formally smooth. Since S_1 and S_2 embed in codimension one, so do $\tilde{S}_1$ and $\tilde{S}_2$. Since $p_{k+1}(S_i, C_i) = p_k(\tilde{S}_i, \tilde{C}_i)$ for all $k \geq 1$, the proof of the proposition will follow if we can show that $p_1(S_1, C_1) = p_1(S_2, C_2)$.

Let $x_i \in S_i$ be the unique closed points. It is clear that $\pi_1^{-1}(x_1)$ maps onto $\pi_2^{-1}(x_2)$. Moreover, $\tilde{f}(\tilde{C}_1) = \tilde{C}_2$. Let $\tilde{x}_i = \pi_i^{-1}(x_i) \cap \tilde{C}_i$. Then $f(\tilde{x}_1) = \tilde{x}_2$. Let $P_i = C_i \times_{S_i} \tilde{S}_i$. A little thought shows that there is a cartesian diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_1 & \longrightarrow & P_2 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \tilde{S}_1 & \longrightarrow & \tilde{S}_2. \end{array}$$

Since S_1 and S_2 embed in codimension one, $P_i = \tilde{C}_i \cup E_i$, where $E_i \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ and $\tilde{C}_i \cap E_i = \tilde{x}_i$. The equality $p_1(S_1, C_1) = p_1(S_2, C_2)$ can then be deduced from (2.5). f

If (S, C) is a local-geometric pair, then S is excellent, so the completion map $\hat{S} \rightarrow S$ is formally smooth. Hence we have:

Corollary 2.9 *If two local-geometric surface-curve pairs embed in codimension one and are analytically isomorphic, then they have the same type.*

Remark 2.10 We do not know if (2.8) and (2.9) are true without the hypothesis of “embedding in codimension one”.

3 Examples

We give three examples which illustrate type computations and pathological aspects of blowing up. Cf. (5.2), where rational double points are dealt with.

The first example illustrates a general conjecture which we cannot yet make precise: amongst surfaces of given degree in $\mathbb{P}^3$, those which occur in positive characteristic can have “larger” type than those which occur in characteristic zero. Of course, the type also depends on the choice of a curve on the surface.

More specifically, the example shows that in characteristic two, a quartic surface (together with a suitably chosen curve) can have $p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = 8$. We expect that this cannot happen in characteristic zero. If so, it would follow from (10.1 = “I”) that a smooth quartic rational curve $C \subset \mathbb{CP}^3$ cannot be the set-theoretic complete intersection of two quartic surfaces, unless C is contained in the singular locus of one of the surfaces.

On the other hand, Hartshorne [15] and Samuel [30] have shown that in positive characteristic, the monomial rational quartic curve $C \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ is a set-theoretic complete intersection. See (10.2) for additional comments.

The second two examples have to do with pairs (S, C) in which S is not Cohen-Macaulay. These seem to be of some intrinsic interest, but have no direct relevance to the problem of set-theoretic complete intersections in $\mathbb{P}^3$. Example two might be viewed as a statement about the properties of the singularity at the vertex of the cone over a space curve. It would be very nice to understand better the connection between this singularity and the properties of the space curve.

Proposition 3.1 *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic two. Let $S \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ be the cuspidal cone given by $y^4 - x^3w = 0$. Let $C \subset S$ be the smooth rational quartic curve given by*

$$(s, t) \mapsto (x, y, z, w) = (s^4, s^3t, st^3, t^4).$$

Then C meets $\text{Sing}(S)$ at the unique point $(0, 0, 0, 1)$, and the type of (S, C) is $(8, 8, 8)$.

PROOF. We will calculate in the category of affine varieties, so we will replace S by an affine variety, and when we refer to a *blowup*, we will actually mean

a correctly chosen affine piece of the blowup. We let (S_n, C_n) denote the n^{th} iterated blowup of (S, C) .

The assertion that $C \cap \text{Sing}(S) = \{(0, 0, 0, 1)\}$ is easily checked. Taking the affine piece at $w = 1$, we find that S is given by $y^4 = x^3$ and that C is given by $x = yz$ and $y = z^3$. Making the change of variable $x \mapsto x + yz$, followed by $y \mapsto y + z^3$, we obtain the new equation:

$$y^4 + z^{12} = (x + yz + z^4)^3$$

for S and the equation $x = y = 0$ for C .

Blow up S along C , formally substituting xy for x . Then S_1 is given by:

$$y^3 = x^3y^2 + x^2y^2z + x^2yz^4 + xy^2z^2 + y^2z^3 + yz^6 + xz^8 + z^9.$$

Intersecting with the exceptional divisor, as in (2.1), corresponds to setting $y = 0$. We obtain $z^8(z + x) = 0$, which tells us that $p_1(S, C) = 8$, and that C_1 is given by $y = 0$, $z + x = 0$. Making the change of variable $z \mapsto z - x$, we obtain the new equation:

$$y^3 = y^2z^3 + yz^6 + x^4yz^2 + x^8z + z^9$$

for S_1 , and the equation $y = z = 0$ for C_1 .

Blow up S_1 along C_1 , formally substituting zy for z . Then S_2 is given by:

$$y^2 = y^4z^3 + y^6z^6 + x^4y^2z^2 + y^8z^9 + x^8z.$$

Setting $y = 0$, we obtain $x^8z = 0$, which tells us that $p_2(S, C) = 8$, and that C_2 is given by $y = z = 0$.

Blow up S_2 along C_2 , formally substituting zy for z . Then the blown up surface S_3 is given by:

$$y = y^6z^3 + y^{11}z^6 + x^4y^3z^2 + y^{16}z^9 + x^8z.$$

Setting $y = 0$, we obtain $x^8z = 0$, which tells us that $p_3(S, C) = 8$, and that the new curve C_3 is given by $y = z = 0$. One can check that S_3 is smooth along C_3 , so $p_k(S, C) = 0$ for all $k > 3$. f

Proposition 3.2 *Let $S \subset \mathbb{A}^4 = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[x, y, z, w]$ be the cone over the monomial quartic curve:*

$$(s, t) \mapsto (x, y, z, w) = (s^4, s^3t, st^3, t^4)$$

in $\mathbb{P}^3$. Let $C \subset S$ be the ruling given by $y = z = w = 0$. Then $\text{type}(S, C) = (1, 2)$. Moreover, if $\pi : S_1 \rightarrow S$ denotes the blowup along C , and $p \in S$ denotes the unique singular point, then $\pi^{-1}(p)_{\text{red}} \cong \text{Proj } \mathbb{C}[s, t, u](s^3 - t^2u)$.

PROOF. One sees that S is given by the equations $yz = xw$, $x^2z = y^3$, $z^3 = yw^2$, and $y^2w = xz^2$. The blowup S_1 of S along C is obtained³ by formally substituting $z = sy$, $w = ty$. Then S_1 is given by $sy = tx$, $sx^2 = y^2$, $s^3 = t^2$, and $ty = s^2x$. Then:

$$\pi_1^{-1}(C) \cong \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[x, y, s, t]/(y, tx, sx^2, s^3 - t^2, s^2x).$$

Set-theoretically,

$$\pi_1^{-1}(C) = V(s, t, y) \cup V(x, y, s^3 - t^2).$$

We have $C_1 = V(s, t, y)$. Thus:

$$p_1(S, C) = \text{length } \mathbb{C}[x, s, t]/(tx, sx^2, s^3 - t^2, s^2x)_{(x, s^3 - t^2)},$$

which equals one.

The blowup S_2 of S_1 along C_1 is obtained by formally substituting $s = ay$, $t = by$. Then S_2 is given by $ax^2 = y$ and $b = a^2x$. Let $\pi_2 : S_2 \rightarrow S_1$ be the blowup map. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_2^{-1}(C_1) &\cong \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[a, b, x]/(ax^2, b - a^2x) \\ &\cong \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[a, x]/(ax^2). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $p_2(S, C) = 2$. Since S_2 is smooth, we see that $\text{type}(S, C)$ is as claimed.

Example 3.3 Let S be a smooth surface, which is a variety. Fix $n \geq 2$, and let $p_1, \dots, p_n \in S$ be distinct (closed) points. Let $\pi : S \rightarrow \bar{S}$ be the morphism which pinches $p_1, \dots, p_n$ together, yielding $p \in \bar{S}$. Let $C \subset S$ be a smooth curve passing through p_1 but not through $p_2, \dots, p_n$. Then $\bar{C} = \pi(C)$ is smooth. Let $f : X \rightarrow \bar{S}$ be the blowup along $\bar{C}$. Then X is obtained from S by blowing up $p_2, \dots, p_n$. Hence $f^{-1}(\bar{C})$ is isomorphic to the disjoint union of $\bar{C}$ with $n - 1$ copies of $\mathbb{P}^1$. The type of (S, C) is $(n - 1)$.

³In this situation, where S does not embed in codimension one, it is apparently necessary to look at all of the affine pieces of the blowup. The details of this are left to the reader. These calculations are greatly facilitated by the use of a computer program such as Macaulay.

4 Classification of rational double point pairs

In this section, we assume that k has characteristic zero. We describe a classification of local-geometric pairs (S, C) , up to analytic isomorphism, where S is the local scheme of a rational double point singularity.

Let (S, C) be a local-geometric pair corresponding to a rational double point. As is well-known, such objects S are classified (up to analytic isomorphism) by A-D-E Dynkin diagrams. Let $\tilde{S}$ be the minimal resolution of S , and let $\tilde{C} \subset \tilde{S}$ be the strict transform of C . Let $E_1, \dots, E_n \subset \tilde{S}$ be the exceptional curves, numbered as in ([18] p. 167). Then $\tilde{C}$ meets a unique exceptional curve E_k , and we have $\tilde{C} \cdot E_k = 1$. Moreover, there are some restrictions on k , depending on S . (See [18] 2.2.)

In this way, we are able to define certain local-geometric pairs $A_{n,k}$, $D_{n,k}$, and $E_{n,k}$. In fact, one can show [20] that these pairs are well-defined, up to analytic isomorphism. We have:

Theorem 4.1 *Let (S, C) be a local-geometric pair, where S is the local scheme of a rational double point singularity. Then (S, C) is analytically isomorphic to a unique member of the following list of local pairs:*

- $A_{n,k}$ (for some positive integers n, k with $k \leq (n+1)/2$);
- $D_{n,1}$ (for some integer $n \geq 4$);
- $D_{n,n}$ (for some integer $n \geq 5$);
- $E_{6,1}$;
- $E_{7,1}$.

Remark 4.2 Equations for these pairs may be found in the proof of (5.2).

5 Invariants of rational double point configurations

In this section, we assume that k has characteristic zero. We will calculate the type of (S, C) in the case where S is the local scheme of a rational double point singularity. This depends not only on S , but also on

C. Note that if S is the local scheme of any rational singularity, and S embeds in a nonsingular three-fold, then S “is” a rational double point.

For each pair of positive integers (n, k) with $k \leq n$, we define a sequence $\phi(n, k)$ of integers, via the following recursive definition:

$$\phi(n, k) = \begin{cases} \phi(n, n - k + 1), & \text{if } k > \frac{n+1}{2}; \\ (k), & \text{if } k = \frac{n+1}{2}; \\ (k, \phi(n - k, k)), & \text{if } k < \frac{n+1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Examples.

- (1) $\phi(n, 1) = (1^{[n]})$ for all $n \geq 1$;
- (2) $\phi(rk, k) = (k^{[r-1]}, 1^{[k]})$ for all $k \geq 1, r \geq 1$ (generalizing 1);
- (3) $\phi(rk - 1, k) = (k^{[r-1]})$ for all $r \geq 2, k \geq 1$ (also generalizing 1);
- (4) $\phi(10, 4) = (4, 3, 1^{[3]})$.

Let $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$. For each integer $n \geq 0$, we define the n^{th} *iterated remainder* on division of a by b , denoted $\text{rem}_n(a, b)$. Let $\text{rem}_0(a, b) = b$, and let $\text{rem}_1(a, b)$ be the usual remainder. For $n \geq 2$, define:

$$\text{rem}_n(a, b) = \begin{cases} \text{rem}_1(\text{rem}_{n-2}(a, b), \text{rem}_{n-1}(a, b)), & \text{if } \text{rem}_{n-1}(a, b) \neq 0; \\ 0, & \text{if } \text{rem}_{n-1}(a, b) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Let $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$. For each integer $n \geq 1$, we define the n^{th} *iterated quotient* of a by b , denoted $\text{div}_n(a, b)$. Let $\text{div}_1(a, b) = \lfloor a/b \rfloor$. For $n \geq 2$, define:

$$\text{div}_n(a, b) = \begin{cases} \text{div}_1(\text{rem}_{n-2}(a, b), \text{rem}_{n-1}(a, b)), & \text{if } \text{rem}_{n-1}(a, b) \neq 0; \\ 0, & \text{if } \text{rem}_{n-1}(a, b) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 5.1 *Fix $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \leq (n + 1)/2$. Let t be the largest integer such that $\text{rem}_t(n - k + 1, k) \neq 0$. Let $r_i = \text{rem}_i(n - k + 1, k)$, $d_i = \text{div}_i(n - k + 1, k)$, for various i . Then:*

$$\phi(n, k) = (r_0^{[d_1]}, r_1^{[d_2]}, \dots, r_t^{[d_{t+1}]}).$$

SKETCH. Define $r_{-1} = n - k + 1$. One shows that for all $p \geq 0$,

$$\phi(r_{p-1} + r_p - 1, r_p) = \begin{cases} (r_p^{[d_{p+1}]}, \phi(r_p + r_{p+1} - 1, r_{p+1})), & \text{if } r_{p+1} \neq 0; \\ (r_p^{[d_{p+1}]}), & \text{if } r_{p+1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

The result then follows by induction. f

Proposition 5.2 *The type of $A_{n,k}$ is $\phi(n, k)$. The type of $D_{n,1}$ is (2). We have:*

$$\text{type}(D_{n,n}) = \begin{cases} (\frac{n}{2}), & \text{if } n \text{ is even;} \\ (\frac{n-1}{2}, 1^{[n-1]}), & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

The type of $E_{6,1}$ is (2, 2). The type of $E_{7,1}$ is (3).

PROOF. We let (S, C) correspond to the given pair. The comments in the first paragraph of the proof of (3.1) apply equally well here. We make use of the explicit resolutions of rational double points given in the appendix to [25].

First we consider the $A_{n,k}$ case. (We allow $1 \leq k \leq n$.) Then S is given by $xy - z^{n+1} = 0$, and C is given parametrically by $x = u^k$, $y = u^{n-k+1}$, $z = u$. [In terms of the notation used in [25], this may be seen as the image of $V(u_k = 1) \subset W_k$.] After making the change of variable $x \mapsto x + z^k$ and $y \mapsto y + z^{n-k+1}$, we find that S is given by:

$$xy + yz^k + xz^{n-k+1} = 0, \tag{*}$$

and that C is given by $x = y = 0$. From now on, we assume that $k \leq \frac{n+1}{2}$. Blow-up along C , formally substituting yx for y . Then S_1 is given by:

$$xy + yz^k + z^{n-k+1} = 0.$$

Intersecting with the exceptional divisor, as in (2.1), corresponds to setting $x = 0$. We obtain $z^k(y + z^{n-2k+1}) = 0$. This tells us that $p_1(S, C) = k$ and that C_1 is given by $x = 0$ and $y + z^{n-2k+1} = 0$. After making the change of variable $y \mapsto y - z^{n-2k+1}$, and thence $y \mapsto -y$, we obtain the equation:

$$xy + yz^k + xz^{n-2k+1} = 0 \tag{**}$$

for S_1 , and the equation $x = y = 0$ for C_1 . If $n - 2k + 1 = 0$, then S_1 is smooth along C_1 , and we are done. Otherwise, compare (*) with (**), to complete the $A_{n,k}$ case.

Now we deal with the case $D_{n,1}$. In terms of the notation used in [25], C is the image of $V(v_0 = 0) \subset W_0$. Following [25], we would have two cases (n even, n odd), but in fact these two cases are identical in this situation, after interchanging variables ($x \leftrightarrow y$). We find that S is given by:

$$x^2z + y^2 - z^{n-1} = 0,$$

and that C is given by $y = z = 0$. Blow up along C , formally substituting zy for z . Then S_1 is given by:

$$x^2z + y - y^{n-2}z^{n-1} = 0.$$

Setting $y = 0$, we obtain $x^2z = 0$. This tells us that $p_1(S, C) = 2$ and that C_1 is given by $y = z = 0$. An easy calculation shows that S_1 is smooth. The result for $D_{n,1}$ follows.

Now we deal with the case $D_{n,n}$. In terms of the notation used in [25], C is the image of $V(u_n = 0) \subset W_n$. We may take the same equation for S as we did in the case $D_{n,1}$. There are two cases:

Case I: n is even. Then C is given parametrically by $x = u^{(n-2)/2}$, $y = 0$, $z = u$. After making the change of variable $x \mapsto x + z^{(n-2)/2}$, we find that S is given by:

$$x^2z + y^2 + 2xz^{n/2} = 0,$$

and that C is given by $x = y = 0$. Blow up along C , formally substituting xy for x . Then S_1 is given by:

$$x^2yz + y + 2xz^{n/2} = 0.$$

Setting $y = 0$, we obtain $xz^{n/2} = 0$. This tells us that $p_1(S, C) = n/2$ and that C_1 is given by $x = y = 0$. One checks that S_1 is smooth.

Case II: n is odd. Then C is given parametrically by $x = 0$, $y = u^{(n-1)/2}$, $z = u$. (In this case, x and y are interchanged from the notation in [25].) After making the change of variable $y \mapsto y + z^{(n-1)/2}$, we find that S is given by:

$$x^2z + y^2 + 2yz^{(n-1)/2} = 0,$$

and that C is given by $x = y = 0$. Blow up along C , formally substituting yx for y . Then S_1 is given by:

$$xz + xy^2 + 2yz^{(n-1)/2} = 0. \tag{***}$$

Setting $x = 0$, we obtain $yz^{(n-1)/2} = 0$. This tells us that:

$$p_1(S, C) = (n - 1)/2$$

and that C_1 is given by $x = y = 0$. Now blow-up along C_1 , formally substituting xy for x . Then the blow-up S_2 is given by:

$$xz + xy^2 + 2z^{(n-1)/2} = 0.$$

Setting $y = 0$, we obtain $z(x + 2z^{(n-1)/2-1}) = 0$. This tells us that $p_2(S, C) = 1$ and that C_2 is given by ($y = 0$ and $x + 2z^{(n-1)/2-1} = 0$). After making the change of variable $x \mapsto x - 2z^{(n-1)/2-1}$, we find that S_2 is given by:

$$xz + xy^2 - 2y^2z^{(n-1)/2-1} = 0,$$

and that C_2 is given by $x = y = 0$.

Now blow up along C_2 , formally substituting xy for x . Then the blown up surface S_3 is given by:

$$xz + xy^2 - 2yz^{(n-1)/2-1} = 0,$$

C_3 is given by $x = y = 0$, and $p_3(S, C) = 1$. Replacing y by $-y$, we may assume that S_3 is given by:

$$xz + xy^2 + 2yz^{(n-1)/2-1} = 0.$$

This looks like (***), except that n is now replaced by $n - 2$. Note that if $n = 1$, then (***) is smooth. A little thought shows that the asserted type of $D_{n,n}$ is correct. A posteriori, we see that $(S_1, C_1) = A_{n-1,1}$. A direct proof of this assertion would of course simplify the proof.

For both $E_{6,1}$ and $E_{7,1}$, we may choose any smooth curve for C .

For $E_{6,1}$, S is given by $x^2 - y^3 - z^4 = 0$, and C is given by $y = 0$, $x + z^2 = 0$. After making the change of variable $x \mapsto x - z^2$, we obtain the new equation $x^2 - 2xz^2 - y^3 = 0$ for S . Then C is given by $x = y = 0$. Blow up along C , substituting xy for x . The equation for S_1 is:

$$x^2y - 2xz^2 - y^3 = 0.$$

Setting $y = 0$, we obtain $xz^2 = 0$. Hence $p_1(S, C) = 2$, and C_1 is given by $x = y = 0$. Blow up S_1 along C_1 , substituting xy for x . The equation for

S_2 is $x^2y^2 - 2xz^2 - y = 0$. Substituting $y = 0$, we obtain $xz^2 = 0$. Hence $p_2(S, C) = 2$. One checks that S_2 is smooth, so $p_k(S, C) = 0$ for all $k > 2$.

For $E_{7,1}$, S is given by $x^2 + y^3 - yz^3 = 0$, and C is given by $x = y = 0$. Blow up along C , substituting yx for y . The equation for S_1 is $x + x^2y^3 - yz^3 = 0$. Setting $x = 0$, we obtain $yz^3 = 0$. Hence $p_1(S, C) = 3$. As S_1 is smooth, we see that the type of $E_{7,1}$ is as claimed. $\square$

Warning! Amongst the rational double point local-geometric pairs, those of the kind $(S, C) = D_{n,n}$ with n odd ($n \geq 5$) are highly atypical. The following phenomena happen only for these special pairs:

- (i) $\Sigma(S, C) < \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p_i(S, C)$;
- (ii) $p_r(S, C) \neq 0$ for some $r > \text{order}(S, C)$: see (5.6).

The calculation in the proposition allows one to compute not just the type of a rational double point, but also the precise sequence of (analytic equivalence classes of) local surface-curve pairs which arise under successive blowups:

- $\text{blowup}(A_{n,k}) \begin{cases} \text{is smooth,} & \text{if } k = \frac{n+1}{2}; \\ = A_{n-k, n-2k+1}, & \text{if } \frac{n-k+1}{2} < k < \frac{n+1}{2}; \\ = A_{n-k, k}, & \text{if } k \leq \frac{n-k+1}{2}; \end{cases}$
- $\text{blowup}(D_{n,1})$ is smooth;
- $\text{blowup}(D_{n,n})$ is smooth, if n is even;
- $\text{blowup}(D_{n,n}) = A_{n-1,1}$, if n is odd;
- $\text{blowup}(E_{6,1}) = A_{3,2}$;
- $\text{blowup}(E_{7,1})$ is smooth.

We now calculate $\text{order}(S, C)$, where S is the local scheme of a rational double point.

Proposition 5.3 *The order of $A_{n,k}$ is the order of $\bar{k}$ in $\mathbb{Z}/(n+1)\mathbb{Z}$. The order of $D_{n,1}$ is 2. The order of $D_{n,n}$ is 2 if n is even, and it is 4 if n is odd. The order of $E_{6,1}$ is 3. The order of $E_{7,1}$ is 2.*

PROOF. Let (S, C) correspond to the given pair. Some of the orders ($E_{6,1}$, $E_{7,1}$, $D_{n,1}$ (n even) and $D_{n,n}$ (n even)) can be computed immediately if one knows the abstract group $\text{Cl}(S)$. A list of these groups may be found in ([22] p. 258). We do not use this approach.

Let $\tilde{S}$ be the minimal resolution of S . Let $E_1, \dots, E_n \subset \tilde{S}$ be the exceptional curves. Let $\tilde{C} \subset \tilde{S}$ denote the strict transform of C . There is a unique $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor $E = a_1 E_1 + \dots + a_n E_n$ such that $\tilde{C} \cdot E_i = -E \cdot E_i$ for all i . (See [26].) The total transform $\overline{C} \subset \tilde{S}$ of C is $\tilde{C} + E$; it is a $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor. According to ([26] p. 242), $\overline{C}$ is integral (i.e. E is integral, i.e. $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{Z}$) if and only if “ C is locally analytically equivalent to zero”. Since S is a rational double point, this is equivalent to $[C] = 0$ in $\text{Cl}(S)$. As this discussion applies not just to C , but also to positive integer multiples of C , we see that the order of (S, C) is the least positive integer N such that $N(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Let M be the inverse of the self-intersection matrix of the E_i . Then $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is the k^{th} column of M . This may be computed from an explicit formula for M , which one may find in ([18] p. 169).

In case $(S, C) = A_{n,k}$, one finds that:

$$a_i = \begin{cases} -k(n-i+1)/(n+1), & \text{if } i \geq k; \\ ki/(n+1) - i, & \text{if } i \leq k. \end{cases}$$

From this we calculate that $a_1 = k/(n+1) - 1$. The proof for $A_{n,k}$ follows.

In case $(S, C) = D_{n,1}$, one finds that:

$$a_i = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } i \leq n-2; \\ -1/2, & \text{if } n-1 \leq i \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Hence $\text{order}(D_{n,1}) = 2$.

In case $(S, C) = D_{n,n}$, one finds that:

$$a_i = \begin{cases} -i/2, & \text{if } i \leq n-2; \\ -(n-2)/4, & \text{if } i = n-1; \\ -n/4, & \text{if } i = n. \end{cases}$$

Hence $\text{order}(D_{n,n})$ is as claimed.

We now deal with the two exceptional cases. The inverses of the self-intersection matrices do not appear in [18], and we omit them here for lack of space. In case $(S, C) = E_{6,1}$, one finds that:

$$(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \left(-\frac{4}{3}, -\frac{5}{3}, -2, -1, -\frac{4}{3}, -\frac{2}{3}\right),$$

and in case $(S, C) = E_{7,1}$, one finds that:

$$(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \left(-\frac{3}{2}, -2, -\frac{5}{2}, -3, -\frac{3}{2}, -2, -1\right). \quad \mathfrak{f}$$

It is interesting to note that for $D_{n,n}$ (n odd), one has $p_r(S, C) \neq 0$ for some $r > \text{order}(S, C)$. This does not occur for the other rational double point pairs, as we shall see in (5.6).

Lemma 5.4 *Let k and N be positive integers, with $k < N$. Assume that $k \nmid N$. Then:*

$$\lfloor N/k \rfloor \leq (N - k)/\gcd(k, N).$$

PROOF. First suppose that $k > N/2$. Then $\lfloor N/k \rfloor = 1$, so we must show that $\gcd(k, N) \leq N - k$. Indeed, if $x|k$ and $x|N$, then $x|(N - k)$, so this is clear.

Hence we may assume that $k \leq N/2$. Since $k \nmid N$, $\gcd(k, N) \leq k/2$. Therefore it suffices to show that $(k/2)(N/k) \leq N - k$. This follows from $k \leq N/2$. $\mathfrak{f}$

Corollary 5.5 *Let k and N be positive integers, with $k \leq N$. Let t be the smallest positive integer such that $\text{rem}_t(N, k) = 0$. Let $d_i = \text{div}_i(N, k)$, for $i = 1, \dots, t$. Then:*

$$d_1 + \dots + d_t \leq N/\gcd(k, N).$$

PROOF. The case $k = N$ is clear, so we may assume that $k < N$. If $t = 1$, the result is clear. Let $r_1 = \text{rem}_1(N, k)$. We may assume that $r_1 \neq 0$. By induction on t , we may assume that:

$$d_2 + \dots + d_t \leq k/\gcd(r_1, k).$$

Therefore it suffices to show that:

$$d_1 + \frac{k}{\gcd(r_1, k)} \leq \frac{N}{\gcd(k, N)}.$$

One sees that $\gcd(r_1, k) = \gcd(k, N)$. Therefore it suffices to show that $d_1 \leq (N - k)/\gcd(k, N)$. This follows from (5.4). $\mathfrak{f}$

Proposition 5.6 *Let (S, C) be a local-geometric pair corresponding to a rational double point. Assume that $(S, C) \neq D_{n,n}$ for any odd integer $n \geq 5$. Then $p_r(S, C) = 0$ for all $r \geq \text{order}(S, C)$.*

PROOF. We utilize (5.2) and (5.3). The only nontrivial case is $(S, C) = A_{n,k}$. We may assume that $k \leq (n+1)/2$. For any $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$, let $o(a, b)$ denote the order of $\bar{a}$ in $\mathbb{Z}/b\mathbb{Z}$. In the notation of (5.1), we must show that:

$$d_1 + \cdots + d_{t+1} < o(k, n+1).$$

Translating to the notation of (5.5) ($N = n+1$), both d_1 and t change by 1. The statement we need is:

$$(d_1 - 1) + d_2 + \cdots + d_t < o(k, N).$$

Since $o(k, N) = N/\gcd(k, N)$, this does follow from (5.5). f

The content of the following proposition may be found in ([18] proof of 2.3, pp. 169-170).

Proposition 5.7 *We have:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(A_{n,k}) &= k(n-k+1)/(n+1) \\ \Delta(D_{n,1}) &= 1 \\ \Delta(D_{n,n}) &= n/4 \\ \Delta(E_{6,1}) &= 4/3 \\ \Delta(E_{7,1}) &= 3/2. \end{aligned}$$

6 Technical lemmas on rational double points

In this section we assume that k has characteristic zero. We prove various technical relationships between the invariants of rational double point local-geometric pairs. We use these results in part III. The result (6.5) appears to be of intrinsic interest.

Proposition 6.1 *Let (S, C) be a local-geometric pair corresponding to a rational double point. Write:*

$$\text{type}(S, C) = (n_1^{[k_1]}, \dots, n_r^{[k_r]})$$

with $n_1 > \cdots > n_r \geq 1$ and $k_i \geq 1$ for each i . Assume that $r > 1$. Then $k_r > 1$ and $n_r | n_{r-1}$.

PROOF. We use (5.2). The proposition is clear if (S, C) is of species D or E . Therefore we may assume that (S, C) is of species A . In the notation of (5.1), we may write:

$$\text{type}(S, C) = (r_0^{[d_1]}, \dots, r_t^{[d_{t+1}]}).$$

Since $r_{t+1} = 0$, we have $r_{t-1} = r_t d_{t+1}$. Hence $r_t | r_{t-1}$. Hence $n_r | n_{r-1}$. Since $r_{t-1} > r_t$, $d_{t+1} > 1$. Hence $k_r > 1$. f

Proposition 6.2 *If $\text{type}(A_{n,k}) = \text{type}(A_{n',k'})$, where $k \leq (n+1)/2$ and $k' \leq (n'+1)/2$, then $n = n'$ and $k = k'$.*

PROOF. We use (5.2). Write $\text{type}(A_{n,k}) = (r_0^{[d_1]}, \dots, r_t^{[d_{t+1}]})$, as in (5.1). Then $n = n' = r_0(d_1 + 1) + r_1 - 1$, and $k = k' = r_0$. f

Lemma 6.3 *Fix positive integers k and N with $k \leq N/2$. Let t be the smallest positive integer such that $\text{rem}_t(N, k) = 0$. Let $r_i = \text{rem}_i(N, k)$, $d_i = \text{div}_i(N, k)$, for various i . Then:*

(i) *If $t = 1$, then $r_0 d_1^{-1} = k^2/N$.*

(ii) *If $t = 2$, then $(r_0 - r_1) d_1^{-1} + r_1 (d_1 + d_2)^{-1} \leq k^2/N$.*

(iii) *If $t \geq 3$, then:*

$$(r_0 - r_1) d_1^{-1} + (r_1 - r_2) (d_1 + d_2)^{-1} + r_2 (d_1 + d_2 + 1)^{-1} \leq k^2/N.$$

PROOF. First suppose that $t = 1$. Then $N = d_1 k$. Hence $k^2/N = k/d_1 = r_0 d_1^{-1}$. This proves (i).

Now suppose that $t = 2$. Then $N = r_0 d_1 + r_1$ and $r_0 = r_1 d_2$. We must show that:

$$\frac{r_0 - r_1}{d_1} + \frac{r_1}{d_1 + d_2} \leq \frac{r_0^2}{r_0 d_1 + r_1}.$$

Substitute $r_0 = r_1 d_2$, and cancel out r_1 . We must show:

$$\frac{d_2 - 1}{d_1} + \frac{1}{d_1 + d_2} \leq \frac{d_2^2}{d_1 d_2 + 1}.$$

Eliminating denominators, we find that we must show:

$$(d_1 - 1)(d_2 - 1) \geq 0,$$

which is certainly true.

Finally, suppose that $t \geq 3$. Then $N = r_0 d_1 + r_1$ and $r_0 = r_1 d_2 + r_2$. We must show that:

$$\frac{r_0 - r_1}{d_1} + \frac{r_1 - r_2}{d_1 + d_2} + \frac{r_2}{d_1 + d_2 + 1} \leq \frac{r_0^2}{r_0 d_1 + r_1}.$$

Substitute $r_0 = r_1 d_2 + r_2$. We must show that:

$$\frac{r_1 d_2 + r_2 - r_1}{d_1} + \frac{r_1 - r_2}{d_1 + d_2} + \frac{r_2}{d_1 + d_2 + 1} \leq \frac{(r_1 d_2 + r_2)^2}{r_1 d_1 d_2 + r_2 d_1 + r_1}.$$

Now cancel denominators. (This is best done with the aid of a computer.) We must show:

$$\begin{aligned} d_2 r_1^2 - d_1^2 d_2 r_1^2 - d_1 d_2^2 r_1^2 + d_1^2 d_2^2 r_1^2 - d_2^3 r_1^2 + d_1 d_2^3 r_1^2 - d_1^2 r_1 r_2 - d_2 r_1 r_2 \\ - d_1 d_2 r_1 r_2 + 2 d_1^2 d_2 r_1 r_2 - d_2^2 r_1 r_2 + d_1 d_2^2 r_1 r_2 + d_1^2 r_2^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently, we must show that:

$$\begin{aligned} r_1^2 d_2 [d_2^2 (d_1 - 1) + d_1 (d_1 d_2 - d_1 - d_2) + 1] \\ + r_1 r_2 [d_1^2 (d_2 - 1) + d_2^2 (d_1 - 1) + d_2 (d_1^2 - d_1 - 1)] + d_1^2 r_2^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

If $d_1 \geq 2$ and $d_2 \geq 2$, this is clear. Since $k \leq N/2$, we have $d_1 \geq 2$. Suppose that $d_2 = 1$. Then the needed inequality simplifies to:

$$r_1 r_2 (d_1^2 - 2) + d_1^2 r_2^2 \geq 0,$$

which is true. f

From (6.3), we obtain the following weaker statement, which we use in (6.5):

Corollary 6.4 *Fix positive integers k and N , with $k \leq N/2$. Let t be the smallest positive integer such that $\text{rem}_t(N, k) = 0$. Let $r_i = \text{rem}_i(N, k)$, $d_i = \text{div}_i(N, k)$, for various i . Then:*

$$(r_0 - r_1) d_1^{-1} + \cdots + (r_{t-1} - r_t) (d_1 + \cdots + d_t)^{-1} \leq k^2 / N.$$

Warning! When we use (6.4), the symbol d_1 will appear to have two different values, differing by 1: in the application (6.5), d_1 will be smaller by 1.

Proposition 6.5 *Let (S, C) correspond to a rational double point singularity. Let $p_k = p_k(S, C)$, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then:*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k(k+1)} p_k \geq \Delta(S, C).$$

PROOF. We use (5.7) and (5.2). If (S, C) is not of species A , then the proposition is proved by the following table:

singularity	$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k(k+1)} p_k$	$\Delta(S, C)$
$D_{n,1}$	1	1
$D_{n,n}$ (n even)	$n/4$	$n/4$
$D_{n,n}$ (n odd)	$\frac{n-1}{4} + \sum_{k=2}^n \frac{1}{k(k+1)}$	$n/4$
$E_{6,1}$	$4/3$	$4/3$
$E_{7,1}$	$3/2$	$3/2$

Suppose that $(S, C) = A_{n,k}$ for some n, k . We may assume that $k \leq (n+1)/2$. We must show that:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j(j+1)} \phi(n, k)_j \geq k(n-k+1)/(n+1). \quad (*)$$

Let t be the largest integer such that $\text{rem}_t(n-k+1, k) \neq 0$. For $i = 0, \dots, t$, let $r_i = \text{rem}_i(n-k+1, k)$, $d_{i+1} = \text{div}_{i+1}(n-k+1, k)$. By (5.1), we see that $(*)$ is equivalent to:

$$\begin{aligned} r_0 \sum_{j=1}^{d_1} \frac{1}{j(j+1)} + r_1 \sum_{j=d_1+1}^{d_1+d_2} \frac{1}{j(j+1)} + \dots + r_t \sum_{j=d_1+\dots+d_{t+1}}^{d_1+\dots+d_{t+1}} \frac{1}{j(j+1)} \\ \geq \frac{k(n-k+1)}{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for any $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ with $a \leq b$,

$$\sum_{j=a+1}^b \frac{1}{j(j+1)} = \frac{b}{b+1} - \frac{a}{a+1}.$$

Hence (*) is equivalent to:

$$\begin{aligned} (r_0 - r_1) \left(\frac{d_1}{d_1 + 1} \right) + \cdots + (r_{t-1} - r_t) \left(\frac{d_1 + \cdots + d_t}{d_1 + \cdots + d_t + 1} \right) \\ + r_t \left(\frac{d_1 + \cdots + d_{t+1}}{d_1 + \cdots + d_{t+1} + 1} \right) \geq k(n - k + 1)/(n + 1). \end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to:

$$\begin{aligned} r_0 - (r_0 - r_1)(d_1 + 1)^{-1} - \cdots - (r_{t-1} - r_t)(d_1 + \cdots + d_t + 1)^{-1} \\ - r_t(d_1 + \cdots + d_{t+1} + 1)^{-1} \geq k(n - k + 1)/(n + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Since $r_0 = k$, this is equivalent to:

$$\begin{aligned} (r_0 - r_1)(d_1 + 1)^{-1} + \cdots + (r_{t-1} - r_t)(d_1 + \cdots + d_t + 1)^{-1} \\ + r_t(d_1 + \cdots + d_{t+1} + 1)^{-1} \leq k^2/(n + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Let $N = n + 1$. Then this follows from (6.4), and thence completes the proof. $\square$

Definition. Let (S, C) be a local-geometric pair corresponding to a rational double point. Then the *deficiency* of (S, C) is:

$$\text{def}(S, C) = \Sigma(S, C) - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p_i(S, C).$$

One always has $\text{def}(S, C) \geq 0$, except for $D_{n,n}$, with n odd, $n \geq 5$.

Part II

Iterated curve blowups

7 Intersection ring of a blow up

In this section we describe (without proof) the intersection ring of the blow-up of a nonsingular variety along a nonsingular subvariety, following the statements given in ([7] 6.7, 8.3.9). There are two differences between the assertions we make and the assertions made in [7]. Firstly, we work with cycles modulo algebraic equivalence, rather than modulo rational equivalence. Secondly, we have adjusted the signs to reflect our convention regarding projective space bundles.

Let X be a nonsingular closed subvariety of a nonsingular variety Y . Let $d = \text{codim}(X, Y)$, and assume that $d \geq 2$. Let N be the normal bundle of X in Y .

Let $\tilde{Y}$ be the blow-up of Y along X . The exceptional divisor is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}N^*$. We use the following diagram to fix notation:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{P}N^* & \xrightarrow{j} & \tilde{Y} \\ \downarrow g & & \downarrow f \\ X & \xrightarrow{i} & Y \end{array}$$

Let $F = \text{Ker}[g^*(N^*) \xrightarrow{\text{can}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}N^*}(1)]$. For each k , there is a canonically split exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow A^{k-d}(X) \xrightarrow{\delta} A^{k-1}(\mathbb{P}N^*) \oplus A^k(Y) \xrightarrow{\beta} A^k(\tilde{Y}) \longrightarrow 0$$

of cycle groups modulo algebraic equivalence. The maps are given by:

$$\delta(x) = (c_{d-1}(F) \cdot g^*(x), i_*(x))$$

and

$$\beta(\tilde{x}, y) = j_*(\tilde{x}) + f^*(y).$$

This describes $A^*(\tilde{Y})$ as an abelian group. The ring structure is described by the following rules:

$$\begin{aligned} (f^*y) \cdot (f^*y') &= f^*(y \cdot y') \\ (j_*\tilde{x}) \cdot (j_*\tilde{x}') &= -j_*((c_1\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}N^*}(1)) \cdot \tilde{x} \cdot \tilde{x}') \\ (f^*y) \cdot (j_*\tilde{x}) &= j_*((g^*i^*y) \cdot \tilde{x}). \end{aligned}$$

8 The intersection ring of an iterated curve blow-up

The result of this section is:

Theorem 8.1 *Let $Y_0 = \mathbb{P}^3$. Let $C_0 \subset Y_0$ be a nonsingular curve of degree d and genus g . Let Y_1 be the blow-up of Y_0 along C_0 . Choose a smooth curve C_1 which lies on the exceptional divisor $E_1 \subset Y_1$ and which meets each ruling on E_1 exactly once. Let Y_2 be the blow-up of Y_1 along C_1 . Iterate this process: Y_{k+1} is obtained by blowing up a smooth curve $C_k \subset E_k \subset Y_k$. We assume that C_k meets each ruling on E_k exactly once and that for all $k \geq 2$, $C_k \neq E_k \cap E_{k-1,k}$, where $E_{k-1,k} \subset Y_k$ denotes the strict transform of E_{k-1} . Let $H \subset Y_0$ be a plane. Let $\mathbf{h} = [H] \in A^1(Y_0)$. Let $\mathbf{e}_k = [E_k] \in A^1(Y_k)$. Let $\mathbf{r}_k \in A^1(E_k)$ denote the class of a ruling, which we identify with its image in $A^2(Y_k)$. Identify $\mathbf{h}$, $\mathbf{e}_k$ and $\mathbf{r}_k$ with their images in the intersection ring $A^*(Y_n)$ of the n^{th} iterated blow-up Y_n . Then $A^k(Y_n)$ has as a basis:*

$$[Y_n] \quad (k=0); \quad \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n \quad (k=1); \quad \mathbf{h}^2, \mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_n \quad (k=2); \quad 1 \quad (k=3).$$

This information, together with the following multiplication rules, completely describe $A^(Y_n)$ as a graded ring: $\mathbf{h}^3 = 1$, $\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{r}_k = 0$, $\mathbf{h}^2 \cdot \mathbf{e}_k = 0$, $\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{r}_j = -\delta_{i,j}$, $\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{e}_k = d\mathbf{r}_k$, $\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}_j = -\beta_i \mathbf{r}_j$ (if $i < j$),*

$$\mathbf{e}_k^2 = -d\mathbf{h}^2 - \alpha_{k-1}\mathbf{r}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i \mathbf{r}_i,$$

where α_k is determined by $[C_k] = c_1 \mathcal{O}_{E_k}(1) - \alpha_k \mathbf{r}_k$ in $A^1(E_k)$, for $k \geq 1$, $\alpha_0 = 2 - 2g - 4d$, and $\beta_k = \alpha_{k-1} - \alpha_k$, for each $k \geq 1$.

We note the following generalization and conceptual reformulation of (8.1), whose proof is omitted. It will not be used again.

Theorem 8.2 *Let Y_0 be a nonsingular complete three-fold. Let $C_0 \subset Y_0$ be a nonsingular curve. Let Y_1 be the blow-up of Y_0 along C_0 . Choose a smooth curve C_1 which lies on the exceptional divisor $E_1 \subset Y_1$ and which meets each ruling on E_1 exactly once. Let Y_2 be the blow-up of Y_1 along C_1 . Iterate this process: Y_{k+1} is obtained by blowing up a smooth curve $C_k \subset E_k \subset Y_k$. We assume that C_k meets each ruling on E_k exactly once and that for all $k \geq 2$,*

$C_k \neq E_k \cap E_{k-1,k}$, where $E_{k-1,k} \subset Y_k$ denotes the strict transform of E_{k-1} . Let $\mathbf{e}_k = [E_k] \in A^1(Y_k)$. Let $\mathbf{r}_k \in A^1(E_k)$ denote the class of a ruling, which we identify with its image in $A^2(Y_k)$. Identify $\mathbf{e}_k$ and $\mathbf{r}_k$ with their images in the intersection ring $A^*(Y_n)$ of the n^{th} iterated blow-up Y_n . Then $A^*(Y_n)$ is the graded $A^*(Y_0)$ -algebra generated by $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$ (degree 1) and $\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_n$ (degree 2), modulo the relations: $A^1(Y_0) \cdot \mathbf{r}_k = 0$, $A^2(Y_0) \cdot \mathbf{e}_k = 0$, $\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{r}_j = -\delta_{i,j}$, $\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{e}_k = (\mathbf{h} \cdot C_0) \mathbf{r}_k$ (for all $\mathbf{h} \in A^1(Y_0)$), $\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}_j = -\beta_i \mathbf{r}_j$ (if $i < j$),

$$\mathbf{e}_k^2 = -[C_0] - \alpha_{k-1} \mathbf{r}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i \mathbf{r}_i,$$

where α_k is determined by $[C_k] = c_1 \mathcal{O}_{E_k}(1) - \alpha_k \mathbf{r}_k$ in $A^1(E_k)$, for $k \geq 1$, $\alpha_0 = \deg(N_{C_0}^*)$, and $\beta_k = \alpha_{k-1} - \alpha_k$, for each $k \geq 1$.

The remainder of this section breaks up into two parts. First we introduce various notations and conventions which we will use in the proof and in subsequent sections. Then we prove (8.1).

There are group homomorphisms $A^i(E_k) \rightarrow A^{i+1}(Y_k)$ and injective ring homomorphisms:

$$A^*(Y_0) \longrightarrow A^*(Y_1) \longrightarrow \dots \longrightarrow A^*(Y_n).$$

We systematically identify various elements with their images, via these maps. Since the latter maps are ring homomorphisms, it is not necessary to distinguish between multiplication in $A^*(Y_i)$ and $A^*(Y_j)$, for any i, j . On the other hand, since the maps $A^i(E_k) \rightarrow A^{i+1}(Y_k)$ are not ring homomorphisms, it is necessary to distinguish between multiplication in $A^*(Y_k)$ and $A^*(E_k)$. We do this by using a dot ($\cdot$) to denote multiplication in $A^*(Y_k)$ and brackets ($\langle, \rangle$) to denote multiplication in $A^*(E_k)$. No problems are introduced by the fact that k does not occur explicitly in the bracket notation.

Let $\mathbf{c}_k = [C_k]$. This is an element of $A^2(Y_k)$, and it is an element of $A^1(E_k)$ if $k \geq 1$. Let $\mathbf{d}_k = c_1 \mathcal{O}_{E_k}(1)$. It is an element of $A^1(E_k)$.

For $k \leq n$, let $E_{k,n} \subset Y_n$ denote the strict transform of E_k . In $A^1(Y_n)$ we have $\mathbf{e}_k = [E_{k,n}] + \dots + [E_{n,n}]$. (This depends on our assumption that $C_k \neq E_k \cap E_{k-1,k}$.) In particular, the reader should observe the following insidious source of error: $\mathbf{e}_k \neq [E_{k,n}]$. This same sort of error applies to other cycles which we shall discuss.

In this section we do not fix a particular ruling $R_k \subset E_k$. We do so in the next section. Having made such a choice, one can then discuss the strict transform $R_{k,n} \subset Y_n$ of R_k .

Let N_k be the normal bundle of C_k in Y_k . Then $E_k \cong \mathbf{P}(N_{k-1}^*)$. For each $k = 0, \dots, n$, we let $\alpha'_k = \deg(N_k^*)$. For each $k = 1, \dots, n$, we let $\beta'_k = \alpha'_{k-1} - \alpha_k$. (We will show that $\alpha_k = \alpha'_k$ and hence that $\beta_k = \beta'_k$.)

PROOF (of 8.1). We make repeated use of the results of §7, without explicitly referring to them. The abelian group structure of $A^*(Y_n)$ and the assertions that $\mathbf{h}^3 = 1$, $\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{r}_k = 0$, $\mathbf{h}^2 \cdot \mathbf{e}_k = 0$, and $\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{r}_j = -\delta_{i,j}$ are left to the reader.

We compute $\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{e}_i$. Let $\mu_i = \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{c}_i$. Note that:

$$\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{e}_i = \mu_{i-1} \mathbf{r}_i.$$

We show that μ_k is independent of k , and in fact equals d . First one checks that $\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{c}_0 = d$. Now we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_i &= \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{c}_i \\ &= \langle (\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{e}_i), \mathbf{c}_i \rangle \\ &= \langle \mu_{i-1} \mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{c}_i \rangle \\ &= \langle \mu_{i-1} \mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{d}_i - \alpha_i \mathbf{r}_i \rangle \\ &= \mu_{i-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\mu_k = d$ for all k . Hence $\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{c}_i = d$ and $\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{e}_i = d \mathbf{r}_i$.

We now work on showing that $\alpha_k = \alpha'_k$. In the process we calculate $\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{c}_j$ for all $i \leq j$, a result we shall need later. We have:

$$\langle \mathbf{d}_i, \mathbf{d}_i \rangle = c_1(N_{i-1}^*) = \alpha'_{i-1}.$$

Further:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{c}_i &= -\langle \mathbf{d}_i, \mathbf{c}_i \rangle \\ &= -\langle \mathbf{d}_i, \mathbf{d}_i - \alpha_i \mathbf{r}_i \rangle \\ &= -(\alpha'_{i-1} - \alpha_i) = -\beta'_i. \end{aligned}$$

Using this we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{c}_{i+1} &= \langle (\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{c}_i) \mathbf{r}_{i+1}, \mathbf{c}_{i+1} \rangle \\ &= \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{c}_i. \end{aligned}$$

Continuing in this manner, the reader may verify that for $i \leq j$, $\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{c}_j = -\beta'_i$.

The class of the canonical divisor on Y_i is given by:

$$[K_{Y_i}] = -4\mathbf{h} + \mathbf{e}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{e}_i.$$

(This may be computed from the formula for the canonical divisor of a blowup – see [9] p. 608.)

For all $i \geq 0$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha'_i &= c_1 N_i^* \\ &= -c_1 \det(N_i) = -[[K_{C_i}] - [K_{Y_i}]|_{C_i}] \\ &= -[[K_{C_i}] - [K_{Y_i}] \cdot \mathbf{c}_i] \\ &= -[2g - 2 - (-4\mathbf{h} + \mathbf{e}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{e}_i) \cdot \mathbf{c}_i] \\ &= -[2g - 2 + 4d + \beta'_1 + \cdots + \beta'_i]. \end{aligned}$$

From this, and from the definition of the β 's and the α 's, we conclude:

$$\alpha'_k = \alpha_k \quad \text{for all } k \geq 0.$$

For $i < j$,

$$\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}_j = (\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{c}_{j-1})\mathbf{r}_j,$$

so we obtain the formula $\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}_j = -\beta_i \mathbf{r}_j$.

We proceed to calculate $\mathbf{e}_k^2$. By the definition of the map δ given in §7, we have:

$$\mathbf{d}_i = \alpha_{i-1}\mathbf{r}_i + \mathbf{c}_{i-1} \quad (i \geq 1).$$

Continuing to calculate, we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}_i &= \mathbf{d}_i - \alpha_i \mathbf{r}_i \quad (i \geq 1) \\ \mathbf{d}_i &= \alpha_{i-1}\mathbf{r}_i + \mathbf{d}_{i-1} - \alpha_{i-1}\mathbf{r}_{i-1} \quad (i \geq 2) \\ \mathbf{d}_i - \mathbf{d}_{i-1} &= \alpha_{i-1}\mathbf{r}_i - \alpha_{i-1}\mathbf{r}_{i-1} \quad (i \geq 2) \\ \mathbf{d}_1 &= \alpha_0 \mathbf{r}_1 + d\mathbf{h}^2 \\ \mathbf{d}_k &= d\mathbf{h}^2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\alpha_{i-1} - \alpha_i) \mathbf{r}_i \right) + \alpha_{k-1} \mathbf{r}_k \quad (k \geq 1) \\ \mathbf{e}_k^2 &= -\mathbf{d}_k \quad (k \geq 1) \\ &= - \left[d\mathbf{h}^2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i \mathbf{r}_i \right) + \alpha_{k-1} \mathbf{r}_k \right]. \end{aligned}$$

f

9 The strict transform of a ruling

The results of this section will be used in the proof of theorem II (10.3). The notations introduced in §8 remain in effect in this section.

Fix a particular ruling $R_k \subset E_k$, where $1 \leq k \leq n$. We compute the class of $R_{k,n}$ in $A^2(Y_n)$. A priori, this is a $\mathbf{Z}$ -linear combination of $\mathbf{h}^2, \mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_n$, which depends on the particular choice of R_k .

We use the term *graph* to mean an undirected graph, which we shall formally view as a reflexive, symmetric relation. By an *augmented graph*, we shall mean a graph, together with a mapping from the set of vertices of that graph to $\mathbf{Z}$. If the augmentation map is injective, we shall refer to the graph as a *labeled graph*, with the obvious connotations.

Let Γ be a labeled graph, which we suppose has a maximum vertex m . We define various labeled graphs, coming from Γ , with maximum vertex $m+1$.

First we define a labeled graph Γ^+ by $\text{vertices}(\Gamma^+) = \text{vertices}(\Gamma) \cup \{m+1\}$ and $\text{edges}(\Gamma^+) = \text{edges}(\Gamma) \cup \{\text{edge}(m, m+1)\}$.

Now suppose that $\text{edge}(l, m) \in \Gamma$. We define a graph Γ^l by $\text{vertices}(\Gamma^l) = \text{vertices}(\Gamma) \cup \{m+1\}$ and

$$\text{edges}(\Gamma^l) = \text{edges}(\Gamma) \cup \{\text{edge}(l, m+1), \text{edge}(m, m+1)\} - \{\text{edge}(l, m)\}.$$

Intuitively, this construction may be thought of as adding a vertex $(m+1)$ “in the middle” of the edge from l to m .

Definition. A *standard operation* is an operation on a labeled graph of the form $\Gamma \mapsto \Gamma^+$ or $\Gamma \mapsto \Gamma^l$ for some l . A *standard labeled graph* is a labeled graph obtained from a one-vertex labeled graph by a finite sequence of standard operations.

It is not hard to see that given a standard labeled graph, one may compute the last standard operation which was performed, and thence undo that operation. It follows that:

Proposition 9.1 *Let G be a standard labeled graph. Then there is a unique sequence of standard operations which gives rise to G .*

Fix integers k and m with $1 \leq k \leq m \leq n$. Let $R_k \subset E_k$ be a ruling. We will show how to associate a certain standard labeled graph $\Gamma_m(R_k)$ to R_k , in such a way that $[R_{k,m}] \in A^2(Y_m)$ depends only on $\Gamma_m(R_k)$.

To do this, consider the set of all curves $H \subset Y_m$ which are the strict transforms of some ruling R_l on E_l , for some l with $k \leq l \leq m$. To each such H , we may associate an integer, namely l . It may be that $H \subset E_{l',m}$, for some l' with $l' \neq l$ and $k \leq l' \leq m$, but this does not matter to us. The set of all such curves H may be viewed as the vertices of a graph $\Gamma_m(k)$: two distinct vertices are connected by an edge if and only if the corresponding two curves on Y_m meet. There is an augmentation on $\Gamma_m(k)$ given by $H \mapsto l$ as above.

Define $\Gamma_m(R_k)$ to be the maximal connected subgraph of $\Gamma_m(k)$ which contains $R_{k,m}$. The augmentation on $\Gamma_m(k)$ induces an augmentation on $\Gamma_m(R_k)$. We shall prove shortly (9.4) that $\Gamma_m(R_k)$ is a labeled graph, and that in fact it is a standard labeled graph.

Lemma 9.2 *If two distinct curves $H_1, H_2 \in \Gamma_m(k)$ meet, then they meet at a unique point, and they meet transversally.*

PROOF. What we need to show is that if $p \leq q$ are integers ($k \leq p, q \leq m$), and if $R_p \subset E_p$ and $R_q \subset E_q$ are rulings, and if $R_{p,m}$ meets $R_{q,m}$ (but $R_{p,m} \neq R_{q,m}$), then in fact $R_{p,m}$ meets $R_{q,m}$ at a unique point and they do so transversally. It suffices to show that $R_{p,q}$ meets R_q in this way. We may assume that $p < q$.

Indeed if $R_{p,q}$ met R_q at more than one point, or if they did not meet transversally, then the image of $R_{p,q}$ under the map $Y_q \rightarrow Y_p$ would be singular, because this map contracts R_q . f

Lemma 9.3 *No three distinct curves $H_1, H_2, H_3 \in \Gamma_m(k)$ meet at a common point.*

PROOF. We may reduce to showing the following: if $p < q < r$ ($k \leq p, q, r \leq m$) and $R_p \subset E_p$, $R_q \subset E_q$, and $R_r \subset E_r$ are rulings, then $R_{p,r} \cap R_{q,r} \cap R_r = \emptyset$. We proceed by contradiction: let $x \in R_{p,r} \cap R_{q,r} \cap R_r$. We may assume that r is minimal with respect to this assertion.

Let y be the image of x under the map $Y_r \rightarrow Y_{r-1}$. Then $y \in R_{p,r-1} \cap R_{q,r-1} \cap C_{r-1}$. If $q < r-1$, then for some ruling $R_{r-1} \subset E_{r-1}$, we have $y \in R_{p,r-1} \cap R_{q,r-1} \cap R_{r-1}$, thereby contradicting the minimality of r . Hence we may assume that $q = r-1$.

To prove the lemma, it suffices to show that $\mathbf{T}_y(R_{p,r-1}) + \mathbf{T}_y(R_{q,r-1}) + \mathbf{T}_y(C_{r-1}) = \mathbf{T}_y(Y_{r-1})$. Since by (9.2) $R_{p,r-1}$ meets $R_{q,r-1}$ at a unique point,

this will imply that $R_{p,r} \cap R_{q,r} = \emptyset$, thereby yielding a contradiction. Substituting $q = r - 1$, we must show:

$$\mathbf{T}_y(R_{p,r-1}) + \mathbf{T}_y(R_{r-1}) + \mathbf{T}_y(C_{r-1}) = \mathbf{T}_y(Y_{r-1}). \quad (*)$$

The curves R_{r-1} and C_{r-1} meet transversally at y , tangentially spanning $\mathbf{T}_y(E_{r-1})$. Therefore, to prove $(*)$, and hence the lemma, it suffices to show that $R_{p,r-1}$ meets E_{r-1} transversally. This may be deduced by repeated application of the following two facts, applied to integers t with $p \leq t \leq r-2$:

- if $R_{p,t}$ meets C_t transversally (on Y_t), then $R_{p,t+1}$ meets E_{t+1} transversally (on Y_{t+1});
- if $R_{p,t}$ meets E_t transversally (on Y_t), then $R_{p,t}$ meets any smooth curve on E_t transversally (if at all). f

Proposition 9.4 *Let $k, m \in \mathbf{Z}$, with $1 \leq k \leq m \leq n$. Let $R_k \subset E_k$ be a ruling. Let $\Gamma = \Gamma_m(R_k)$. Then Γ is a standard labeled graph with vertices $[k, m] \cap \mathbf{Z}$, and provided that $m < n$, $\Gamma_{m+1}(R_k)$ is obtained from Γ by a single standard operation.*

PROOF. By induction, we may assume that Γ is a standard labeled graph with vertices $[k, m] \cap \mathbf{Z}$. For each q between k and m , let $R_q \subset E_q$ be the ruling corresponding to the vertex $q \in \Gamma$.

First we show $(*)$ that if l is such that $k \leq l < m$ and $R_{l,m}$ meets C_m , then in fact $R_{l,m}$, R_m , and C_m meet at a common point. Suppose otherwise: $R_{l,m} \cap R_m \cap C_m = \emptyset$. We will obtain a contradiction. We may choose m to be as small as possible. There are two cases.

Case (a). We have $l = m - 1$. Since R_{m-1} meets C_{m-1} transversally at a single point, $R_{m-1,m}$ meets E_m at a single point. Since Γ is a standard labeled graph, it is clear that $R_{m-1,m}$ meets R_m . Since $R_{m-1,m}$ meets C_m , we see that $R_{m-1,m}$ meets E_m at two distinct points: contradiction. This proves case (a).

Case (b). We have $l < m - 1$. Since $R_{l,m}$ meets C_m (and a fortiori $R_{l,m}$ meets E_m), it follows that $R_{l,m-1}$ meets C_{m-1} . By the minimality of m , $R_{l,m-1} \cap R_{m-1} \cap C_{m-1} \neq \emptyset$. It follows that $R_{l,m}$ and $R_{m-1,m}$ meet at a common ruling on E_m . Since $R_{m-1,m}$ meets R_m , it is clear that this ruling must be R_m . Hence $R_{l,m}$ meets R_m . Thus $R_{l,m}$ meets both R_m and C_m , but the

three curves do not meet at a common point. Hence $R_{l,m}$ meets two distinct rulings on E_m . Hence $R_{l,m-1}$ meets C_{m-1} at ≥ 2 distinct points, so R_l meets C_l at ≥ 2 distinct points: contradiction. This proves case (b), and hence (*).

We now proceed with the proof of the proposition. There are two cases.

Case I. For no l (with $k \leq l < m$) is it true that $R_{l,m}$, R_m and C_m have a point in common. We claim that $\Gamma_{m+1}(R_k) = \Gamma^+$. It suffices to show that R_m is the unique curve in Γ which meets C_m . This follows from (*).

Case II. For some l (with $k \leq l < m$), $R_{l,m}$, R_m and C_m have a point (say x) in common. We claim that $\Gamma_{m+1}(R_k) = \Gamma^l$. To prove this, we need to prove two things:

- (i) for any q such that $k \leq q < m$ and $q \neq l$, $R_{q,m}$ does not meet C_m ;
- (ii) $\mathbf{T}_x(R_{l,m}) + \mathbf{T}_x(R_m) + \mathbf{T}_x(C_m) = \mathbf{T}_x(Y_m)$.

The first assertion follows immediately from (*) and from (9.3). The second assertion follows from the proof of (9.3). f

Lemma 9.5 *Let G be a standard labeled graph, constructed from the single vertex graph $\{k\}$ by a sequence of standard operations $+, k^{[p]}, o_1, \dots, o_r$, for some $p, r \geq 0$, such that $o_1 \neq k$. Then $G - \{k\}$ is a standard labeled graph, which can be constructed from the single vertex graph $\{k+1\}$ by the sequence of standard operations:*

$$\begin{cases} +^{[p]}, o_1, \dots, o_r, & \text{if } p \geq 1; \\ +, o_2, \dots, o_r, & \text{if } p = 0 \text{ and } r \geq 1; \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } p = r = 0. \end{cases}$$

The proof of this lemma is left to the reader.

Let G be a standard labeled graph, with smallest vertex k , having at least two vertices. It is clear that there is a unique $r > k$ such that edge (k, r) is in G . We define the *order* of G to be $r - k$. Moreover, if G has order p , then G is constructed from the single vertex graph $\{k\}$ by a sequence of operations which begins with $+, k^{[p-1]}$, and whose next operation (if any) is not k .

Let G be any standard labeled graph, with vertices $k, \dots, m$. We associate a function $\mu_G : G \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$, defined by inducting on G : if G is a single vertex graph, then $\mu_G(k) = 1$. If G is any standard labeled graph, then $\mu_{G^+}(j) = \mu_G(j)$ and $\mu_{G^l}(j) = \mu_G(j)$ for all j with $k \leq j \leq m$, and $\mu_{G^+}(m+1) = \mu_G(m)$, $\mu_{G^l}(m+1) = \mu_G(m) + \mu_G(l)$. The fact that μ_G is well-defined follows from (9.1).

Proposition 9.6 *Let G be a standard labeled graph, with smallest vertex k , having at least two vertices. Then:*

$$\mu_G = \mu_{\{k\}} + \sum_{i=1}^{\text{ord}(G)} \mu_{G-\{k, \dots, k+i-1\}},$$

where the functions on the right hand side are viewed as functions on G , via extension by zero.

SKETCH. Use (9.5). If $p = \text{ord}(G)$, then

$$G \longleftrightarrow +, k^{[p-1]}, *$$

where $*$ is a sequence of standard operations (possibly empty), not beginning with k . The case $p = 1$ is left to the reader. For $p \geq 2$:

$$G - \{k\} \longleftrightarrow +^{[p-1]}, *$$

$$G - \{k, k+1\} \longleftrightarrow +^{[p-2]}, *$$

and so forth:

$$G - \{k, \dots, k+p-2\} \longleftrightarrow +, *$$

$$G - \{k, \dots, k+p-1\} \longleftrightarrow *'$$

where $'$ can be determined from (9.5). We compute μ in a special case, namely when $*$ is empty. Then:

$$G \longleftrightarrow (1, 1, 2, 3, \dots, p)$$

$$G - \{k\} \longleftrightarrow (0^{[1]}, 1^{[p]})$$

...

$$G - \{k, \dots, k+p-1\} \longleftrightarrow (0^{[p]}, 1^{[1]}),$$

where the sequences on the right are $(\mu(k), \dots, \mu(k+p))$. In this case the proposition is clear. The general case is left to the reader. f

Corollary 9.7 *Fix an integer k with $1 \leq k \leq n$. Let $R_k \subset E_k$ be a ruling. If $k = n$ then $[R_{k,n}] = \mathbf{r}_n$, and if $k < n$, then there exists an integer l , with $k < l \leq n$, such that*

$$[R_{k,n}] = \mathbf{r}_k - \sum_{i=k+1}^l \mathbf{r}_i.$$

SKETCH. For each integer m with $k \leq m \leq n$, let $R_m \subset E_m$ be the ruling which enters into $\Gamma_n(R_k)$. For each integer l with $k \leq l \leq n$, write:

$$\mu_{\Gamma_n(R_l)} = (b_l, \dots, b_n).$$

By considering the scheme-theoretic inverse image of R_l under the map $Y_n \rightarrow Y_l$, one can show that:

$$\mathbf{r}_l = b_l[R_{l,n}] + \dots + b_n[R_{n,n}].$$

The result then follows from (9.6). f

Corollary 9.8 *Let $H \subset Y_n$ be a cycle which is a sum of strict transforms of rulings. Then $[H]$ is a positive $\mathbf{Z}$ -linear combination of the classes:*

$$\mathbf{r}_n, (\mathbf{r}_{n-1} - \mathbf{r}_n), (\mathbf{r}_{n-2} - \mathbf{r}_{n-1} - \mathbf{r}_n), \dots, (\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2 - \dots - \mathbf{r}_n).$$

Corollary 9.9 *Let $H \subset Y_n$ be a cycle which is a sum of strict transforms of rulings. Then there exists integers $a_1, \dots, a_n$ such that $[H] = a_1\mathbf{r}_1 + \dots + a_n\mathbf{r}_n$ and for each integer k with $1 \leq k \leq n$, we have:*

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} 2^{k-i-1} a_i \right) + a_k \geq 0.$$

Part III

Application to set-theoretic complete intersections

10 Theorems I and II

Let $S, T \subset \mathbf{P}^3$ be surfaces of degrees s and t , respectively. Write $S_0 = S$, $T_0 = T$. Assume that $S \cap T$ is set-theoretically a smooth curve $C = C_0$. Let $d = \deg(C)$. Then $d|st$. Let $n = st/d$. Assume that $C \not\subset \text{Sing}(S)$ and that $C \not\subset \text{Sing}(T)$. Let $Y_0 = \mathbf{P}^3$. Let Y_1 be the blow-up of Y_0 along C_0 .

Let $S_1 \subset Y_1$ be the strict transform of S . There is a unique curve $C_1 \subset S_1$ which maps isomorphically onto C_0 . Let Y_2 be the blow-up of Y_1 along C_1 . Iterate this process. This puts us in the situation of (8.1). Let $p_i = p_i(S, C)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

For each $k = 1, \dots, n$, let S_k and T_k denote the strict transforms of S and T on Y_k . Since $C \not\subset \text{Sing}(S)$ and $C \not\subset \text{Sing}(T)$, it follows that for each k with $0 \leq k \leq n$, S_k meets T_k along C_k with multiplicity $n-k$. As consequences of this, we see that $S_n \cap T_n$ is a union of strict transforms of rulings, and that $[S_k] = s\mathbf{h} - \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{e}_i$, $[T_k] = t\mathbf{h} - \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{e}_i$.

First we derive the formula:

$$\beta_k = ds + (2 - 4d - 2g) - p_k. \quad (*)$$

We have $[S_k] \cdot \mathbf{e}_k = \mathbf{c}_k + p_k \mathbf{r}_k$. (See 2.1.) Combining this with $[S_k] = s\mathbf{h} - \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{e}_i$, $\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{e}_k = d\mathbf{r}_k$ (from 8.1), and $\mathbf{c}_k = \mathbf{d}_k - \alpha_k \mathbf{r}_k$ (from p. 32), we obtain:

$$ds\mathbf{r}_k - \sum_{i=1}^k (\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}_k) = \mathbf{d}_k - \alpha_k \mathbf{r}_k + p_k \mathbf{r}_k.$$

Combine this with $\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}_k = -\beta_i \mathbf{r}_k$ (if $i < k$) (from 8.1) and $\mathbf{e}_k^2 = -\mathbf{d}_k$ (from p. 32) to obtain:

$$ds\mathbf{r}_k + (\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_{k-1})\mathbf{r}_k = -\alpha_k \mathbf{r}_k + p_k \mathbf{r}_k.$$

Combine this with the formula:

$$\alpha_k = (2 - 4d - 2g) - (\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_k) \quad (**)$$

from p. 32, to obtain (*).

Since $S_n \cap T_n$ is a union of strict transforms of rulings, it follows from (9.9) that:

$$(s\mathbf{h} - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i)(t\mathbf{h} - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i) = \sum_{l=1}^n a_l \mathbf{r}_l, \quad (***)$$

for some integers a_l such that for each k with $1 \leq k \leq n$, we have:

$$\left(\sum_{m=1}^{k-1} 2^{k-m-1} a_m \right) + a_k \geq 0.$$

We proceed to analyze the consequences of this. The left hand side of (***) equals:

$$\begin{aligned}
& st\mathbf{h}^2 - d(s+t)\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{r}_i\right) - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \beta_i \mathbf{r}_j - \sum_{1 \leq j < i \leq n} \beta_j \mathbf{r}_i \\
& - \sum_{k=1}^n \left[d\mathbf{h}^2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i \mathbf{r}_i \right) + \alpha_{k-1} \mathbf{r}_k \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Then for each m with $1 \leq m \leq n$:

$$-a_m = d(s+t) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \beta_i + (n-m)\beta_m + \alpha_{m-1}.$$

Substituting $\alpha_k = (2 - 4d - 2g) - (\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_k)$, we obtain:

$$-a_m = d(s+t) + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \beta_i + (n-m)\beta_m + (2 - 4d - 2g).$$

In the special case where $\text{Sing}(S) \cap \text{Sing}(T) = \emptyset$, we have $a_m = 0$ for all m , with $1 \leq m \leq n$. Now substitute $\beta_i = ds + (2 - 4d - 2g) - p_i$. We obtain:

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} p_i \right) + (n-m)p_m = d[n(s-4) + t] + (2 - 2g)n.$$

This implies:

Theorem 10.1 (“I”) *Let $C \subset \mathbf{P}^3$ be a smooth curve of degree d and genus g . Suppose that $C = S \cap T$, where S and T are surfaces of degree s and t respectively. Assume that $\text{Sing}(S) \cap \text{Sing}(T) = \emptyset$. Let $n = st/d$. Let $p_i = p_i(S, C)$, for each $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, as defined in §2. Then:*

$$p_1 = \dots = p_{n-1} = \frac{1}{n-1} \{d[n(s-4) + t] + (2 - 2g)n\}.$$

Example 10.2 If $s = t = 4$, $d = 4$, $g = 0$, we obtain $p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = 8$. This can occur in characteristic two, at least. Indeed, let (S, C) be as in (3.1), and let T be given by $z^4 - xw^3 = 0$.

We now return to the general case. For each k with $1 \leq k \leq n$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\sum_{m=1}^{k-1} 2^{k-m-1} [d(s+t) + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \beta_i + (n-m)\beta_m + (2-4d-2g)] \right) \\
& + [d(s+t) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i + (n-k)\beta_k + (2-4d-2g)] \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

A simplification yields:

$$2^{k-1} [d(s+t-4) + 2-2g] + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} 2^{k-i-1} (n-i+1) \beta_i \right) + (n-k)\beta_k \leq 0.$$

Note that:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} 2^{k-i-1} (n-i+1) = (n-1)2^{k-1} + k - n.$$

Substitute $\beta_i = ds + (2-4d-2g) - p_i$. We obtain:

Theorem 10.3 (“II”) *Let $C \subset \mathbf{P}^3$ be a smooth curve of degree d and genus g . Suppose that $C = S \cap T$, where S and T are surfaces of degree s and t respectively. Assume that $C \not\subset \text{Sing}(S)$ and $C \not\subset \text{Sing}(T)$. Let $n = st/d$. Let $p_i = p_i(S, C)$, for each $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, as defined in §2. Then for each $k = 1, \dots, n-1$, we have:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} 2^{k-i-1} (n-i+1) p_i + (n-k) p_k \geq 2^{k-1} \{dt + n[d(s-4) + 2-2g]\}.$$

Examples.

- $s = 2, t = 3, d = 3, g = 0$: then the theorem yields the single inequality $p_1 \geq 1$;
- $s = 2, t = 2, d = 1, g = 0$: as above the theorem yields $p_1 \geq 1$;
- $s = 4, t = 4, d = 4, g = 0$: the theorem yields three inequalities:
 - (i) $p_1 \geq 8$;
 - (ii) $2p_1 + p_2 \geq 24$;
 - (iii) $8p_1 + 3p_2 + p_3 \geq 96$.

11 Theorems III, Q, and B

Theorem 11.1 (“III”) *Let $C \subset \mathbf{CP}^3$ be a smooth curve of degree d and genus g which is the set-theoretic complete intersection of two surfaces S, T of degrees s, t , respectively. Let $n = st/d$. Let $p_k = p_k(S, C)$, for each $k \in \mathbf{N}$. Assume that S has only rational singularities. Assume that $C \not\subset \text{Sing}(T)$. Then:*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k(k+1)} p_k \geq \frac{d^2}{s} + d(s-4) + 2 - 2g.$$

PROOF. By ([18] 1.1), we know that $\Delta(S, C) = d^2/s + d(s-4) + 2 - 2g$. Apply (6.5). f

Remark 11.2 In the statement of (11.1), we do not know if $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}$ can be replaced by $\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}$. From (5.6), we see that this can at least be done if (S, C) does not contain any singularities of type $D_{n,n}$ (with n odd).

Lemma 11.3 *Let $S \subset \mathbf{CP}^3$ be a surface of degree s having only rational singularities. Let $\pi : \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ be a minimal resolution. Let N be the number of exceptional curves on $\tilde{S}$. Then:*

$$N \leq \frac{s}{3}(2s^2 - 6s + 7) - 1.$$

PROOF. Clearly $N \leq \text{rank NS}(\tilde{S}) - 1$. Also $\text{rank NS}(\tilde{S}) \leq h^{1,1}(\tilde{S})$, so it suffices to show that $h^{1,1}(\tilde{S}) = \frac{s}{3}(2s^2 - 6s + 7)$. By simultaneous resolution of rational double points [2], and deformation invariance of Hodge numbers, we may reduce to showing that $h^{1,1}(S) = \frac{s}{3}(2s^2 - 6s + 7)$ if S is itself nonsingular. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} h^{1,1}(S) &= h^2(S, \mathbf{Q}) - 2h^2(S, \mathcal{O}_S) \\ &= [\chi_{\text{top}}(S) + 4h^1(S, \mathcal{O}_S) - 2] - 2h^2(S, \mathcal{O}_S). \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that the top Chern class of the tangent bundle equals the Euler characteristic (see e.g. [1] 11.24, 20.10.6), and using Riemann-Roch, we find:

$$\chi_{\text{top}}(S) = c_2(S) = 12\chi(S) - c_1^2(S) = 12(1 - h^1(S, \mathcal{O}_S) + h^2(S, \mathcal{O}_S)) - (4-s)^2s.$$

The formula for $h^{1,1}$ follows from $h^1(S, \mathcal{O}_S) = 0$ and

$$h^2(S, \mathcal{O}_S) = \binom{s-1}{3}. \quad \mathfrak{f}$$

Remark 11.4 We do not know if the lemma remains valid if $\mathbf{C}$ is replaced by an algebraically closed field of positive characteristic.

Lemma 11.5 *Let $(p_k)_{k \in \mathbf{N}}$ be a sequence of nonnegative integers. Let n be a nonnegative integer. Assume that:*

- (i) $p_1 \leq 9 - \frac{2}{5}n$
- (ii) $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq p_3 \geq \cdots$
- (iii) $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p_k \leq 19 - n$
- (iv) $n/4 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k(k+1)} p_k \geq 6.$

Then $n = 0$ and $(p_k) \in \{(9, 8, 2), (9, 9), (9, 9, 1)\}.$

PROOF. Constraints (i), (iii), and (iv) imply that

$$n/4 + \frac{1}{2}[9 - \frac{2}{5}n] + \frac{1}{6}(19 - n - [9 - \frac{2}{5}n]) \geq 6.$$

It follows that $n \in \{0, 2\}.$

Suppose that $n = 2.$ Then the same constraints imply that

$$1/2 + \frac{1}{2}p_1 + \frac{1}{6}(17 - p_1) \geq 6,$$

so $p_1 = 8.$ Now we see that the left hand side of (iv) is maximized when $(p_k) = (8, 8, 1).$ In that case, the left hand side of (iv) is $5\frac{11}{12}:$ contradiction.

Hence $n = 0.$ Then

$$\frac{1}{2}p_1 + \frac{1}{6}(19 - p_1) \geq 6,$$

so $p_1 = 9.$ If $p_2 \leq 7,$ then the sum in (iv) is bounded by the sum obtained when $(p_k) = (9, 7, 3).$ This sum is $< 6,$ so $p_2 \not\leq 7.$ Hence $p_2 \in \{8, 9\}.$ Etc. $\mathfrak{f}$

Proposition 11.6 *Let $C \subset \mathbf{CP}^3$ be a smooth curve of degree d and genus g , which lies on a surface $S \subset \mathbf{CP}^3$ of degree s . Assume that $C \not\subset \text{Sing}(S)$. Let $p_1 = p_1(S, C)$. Let N be the normal bundle of C in $\mathbf{CP}^3$, and let l be the maximum degree of a sub-line-bundle of N . Let $k = 3d + (2g - 2) - l$. Then $p_1 \leq d(s - 1) - k$.*

PROOF. We use the notation of (8.1). We also use various facts from §10, which although apparently dependent on another surface T , actually make sense in this context. We have $\langle \mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_1 \rangle \geq \deg(N) - 2l$. Since $\deg(N) = 4d + 2g - 2$ and $k = 3d + (2g - 2) - l$, we have:

$$\langle \mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_1 \rangle \geq -2d + 2 - 2g + 2k. \quad (\dagger)$$

Now $\mathbf{c}_1 = \mathbf{d}_1 - \alpha_1 \mathbf{r}_1$ in $A^1(E_1)$, and $\langle \mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_1 \rangle = 2 - 2g - 4d$, so:

$$\langle \mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_1 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_1 \rangle - 2\alpha_1 = 2 - 2g - 4d - 2\alpha_1.$$

Combining this with $(\dagger)$, we obtain $d + \alpha_1 \leq -k$. The formulas $(*)$ and $(**)$ from §10 imply that $\alpha_1 = p_1 - ds$. Hence $p_1 \leq d(s - 1) - k$. f

Remark 11.7 This result (11.6) is a strengthening of the very elementary fact that:

$$|\text{Sing}(S) \cap C| \leq d(s - 1).$$

Theorem 11.8 (“Q”) *Let $C \subset \mathbf{CP}^3$ be a curve. Assume that $C = S \cap T$ set-theoretically for some surfaces S and T . Assume that S is normal. Assume that $\deg(C) > \deg(S)$. Then C is linearly normal.*

PROOF. To any Weil divisor E on a normal surface S , one can associate a reflexive $\mathcal{O}_S$ -module $\mathcal{O}_S(E)$. We recall the following result of Sakai from [29], which is a slightly less general version of theorem 5.1 of that paper:

Let S be a normal projective surface. Let D be a nef Weil divisor on S with $D^2 > 0$. Then $H^1(S, \mathcal{O}_S(-D)) = 0$.

Since the canonical map $H^0(\mathbf{P}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^3}(1)) \rightarrow H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(1))$ is surjective, it suffices to show that the canonical map $H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(1)) \rightarrow H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_C(1))$ is

surjective. Let H be a hyperplane section of S . From the long exact sequence coming from

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_S(H - C) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_S(H) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_C(H) \longrightarrow 0,$$

we see that it is sufficient to show that $H^1(S, \mathcal{O}_S(H - C)) = 0$.

Let $d = \deg(C)$. Let $s = \deg(S)$, $t = \deg(T)$, and let n be the multiplicity of intersection of S with T along C , $n = st/d$. Since $d > s$, we have $t > n$. Hence $(t - n)H$ is a very ample Cartier divisor. Since $n(C - H) \sim (t - n)H$, the theorem follows from Sakai's result. $\square$

Corollary 11.9 *Let $C \subset \mathbf{CP}^3$ be a smooth curve. Assume that C is the set theoretic complete intersection of two normal surfaces S and T , with multiplicity ≤ 3 . Then C is linearly normal.*

PROOF. Using the notation of the proof of (11.8), we are done if either s or t is bigger than n . Otherwise, $d \leq 3$, and so C is linearly normal anyway. $\square$

Remark 11.10 For the case of multiplicity 4, we must have C linearly normal, except possibly for the case where C is a rational quartic, which is the set-theoretic complete intersection of two normal quartic surfaces. It is not known if this is possible.

Theorem 11.11 (“B”) *Let $S, T \subset \mathbf{CP}^3$ be surfaces. Assume that $S \cap T$ is set-theoretically a smooth curve. Assume that $\deg(S) = 4$ and that S has only rational singularities. Then C is linearly normal.*

PROOF. Let C have degree d and genus g . By (11.8), we may assume that $d = 4$ and $g = 0$. By [18], we may assume that $\deg(T) \geq 4$. Since $\deg(S) \leq \deg(T)$, we may assume that $C \not\subset \text{Sing}(T)$, as follows. Suppose that $C \subset \text{Sing}(T)$. Write $S = V(f)$, $T = V(g)$. Choose h so that $\deg(fh) = \deg(g)$, and so that $C \not\subset V(h)$. Then $C \not\subset \text{Sing}(V(fh + g))$. Hence we may replace T by $V(fh + g)$.

Write $(S, C) = (S', C') + (S'', C'')$, where

$$(S'', C'') = D_{n_1, n_1} + \cdots + D_{n_r, n_r},$$

$n_1, \dots, n_r$ are odd integers ≥ 5 , and (S', C') is a configuration which does not involve any such singularities. Let $p_i = p_i(S', C')$. Let $n = n_1 + \dots + n_r$. We show that the hypotheses of (11.5) are satisfied.

We apply (11.6), using that fact [5] that $l = 7$, concluding that $p_1(S, C) \leq 9$. We have $p_1(\sum D_{n_i, n_i}) = \sum (n_i - 1)/2$ by (5.2), and $n_i - 1 \geq \frac{4}{5}n_i$, so $p_1(\sum D_{n_i, n_i}) \geq \frac{2}{5}n$. Thus hypothesis (i) is satisfied. Hypothesis (ii) holds. Hypothesis (iii) follows from (11.3) and from the fact that (S', C') contains no $D_{m, m}$ pairs with m odd, $m \geq 5$, so that $\text{def}(S', C') \geq 0$. To prove hypothesis (iv), we would like to use (11.1 = "III"), but that is not quite good enough. By (6.5),

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k(k+1)} p_k \geq \Delta(S', C').$$

Let $s = \deg(S) = 4$. By ([18] 1.1), we know that:

$$\Delta(S, C) = d^2/s + d(s-4) + 2 - 2g = 6.$$

Then $\Delta(S', C') = \Delta(S, C) - \Delta(S'', C'')$. By (5.7), $\Delta(S'', C'') = n/4$. Hypothesis (iv) follows.

By (11.5), we conclude that $n = 0$ and that:

$$\text{type}(S, C) \in \{(9, 8, 2), (9, 9), (9, 9, 1)\}.$$

We will use (5.2), (6.1), and (6.2).

Suppose that $\text{type}(S, C) = (9, 9, 1)$. Then for some $p \in C$, $\text{type}(S, C)_p = (r, 1, 1)$ for some $r \geq 1$. The case $r > 1$ is impossible because $\text{type}(S, C) - \text{type}(S, C)_p = (9-r, 9-1)$ and $9-r \geq 9-1$. Hence $\text{type}(S, C)_p = (1, 1, 1)$. Hence $(S, C)_p = A_{3,1}$. Since $\Sigma(S, C) \leq 19$ by (11.3), and since $9+9+1 = 19$, we have $\text{def}(S, C) = 0$. Therefore, since the other singularities of S along C have type (k, k) for some $k \leq 8$, we see that the other singularities must be $A_{3k-1, k}$ for some $k \in \{1, \dots, 8\}$, depending on the singular point. Amongst these, only $A_{2,1}$ has deficiency zero. Hence $(S, C) = 8A_{2,1} + A_{3,1}$. Hence $\Delta(S, C) = 8(\frac{2}{3}) + \frac{3}{4} \neq 6$: contradiction.

Now suppose that $\text{type}(S, C) = (9, 8, 2)$. Then for some $p \in C$,

$$\text{type}(S, C)_p \in \{(1, 1, 1), (2, 1, 1), (2, 2, 2)\}.$$

These types are realized by the singularities $A_{3,1}$, $A_{4,2}$, and $A_{7,2}$, respectively, and by no others. Since $A_{7,2}$ has nonzero deficiency, it can be excluded. Hence

$(S, C)_p \in \{A_{3,1}, A_{4,2}\}$. If $(S, C)_p = A_{4,2}$, we find (by analogy with the $(9, 9, 1)$ case) that $(S, C) = 6A_{2,1} + A_{3,1} + A_{4,2}$. Hence $\Delta(S, C) = 6(\frac{2}{3}) + \frac{3}{4} + \frac{6}{5} \neq 6$: contradiction. If $(S, C)_p = A_{3,1}$, then we may assume that $(S, C) = 2A_{3,1} + \text{other}$, where the “other” part must have type $(7, 6)$. The only zero-deficiency rational double point configuration which realizes this type is $A_{1,1} + 6A_{2,1}$. Hence $(S, C) = A_{1,1} + 6A_{2,1} + 2A_{3,1}$. By [24], the sum of the contributions of the singularities must not exceed $(2/3) \deg(S)(\deg(S) - 1)^2 = 24$, where each singularity p contributes $e(E) - 1/|G|$, $e(E)$ is the topological Euler characteristic of the exceptional fiber in the minimal resolution of p , and G is the order of the group which defines p as a quotient singularity. In particular, an A_n singularity contributes $(n + 1) - (n + 1)^{-1}$. Then the sum of the contributions is 25: contradiction.

Suppose that $\text{type}(S, C) = (9, 9)$. Then each singularity of S along C must have type (k, k) for some k , depending on the singular point. Hence (S, C) must be built up from $E_{6,1}$ and $A_{3k-1,k}$ for various k . Since $\text{def}(E_{6,1}) = 2$, we may rule out that case. In fact, there are only two configurations with deficiency ≤ 1 : either $(S, C) = 9A_{2,1}$ or else $(S, C) = 7A_{2,1} + A_{5,2}$. In both cases, $\text{order}(S, C) = 3$. Hence we may assume that $\deg(T) = 3$. By [18], we know that this is impossible. f

12 Theorem A

Lemma 12.1 *Let $s, t, d, g \in \mathbf{Z}$. Assume that $t \geq s \geq 4$, $d \geq 1$, and $g \geq 0$. Assume that $d \mid st$. Let $n = st/d$. Assume that $n \geq 2$. Let $r = d[n(s - 4) + t] + (2 - 2g)n$. Assume that $r \leq \frac{s}{3}(2s^2 - 6s + 7) - 1$. Then $d \leq g + 3$.*

PROOF. We assume that $d \geq g + 4$, working toward a contradiction. We have $2 - 2g \geq 10 - 2d$, so:

$$d[n(s - 4) + t] + (10 - 2d)n \leq \frac{s}{3}(2s^2 - 6s + 7) - 1. \quad (*)$$

First suppose that $s = 4$. Then $t \geq 4$, $t \geq d/2$, and $dt + (10 - 2d)n \leq 19$. Substituting $n = st/d = 4t/d$ and simplifying, we obtain:

$$(d^2 - 8d + 40)t \leq 19d. \quad (\dagger)$$

Since $t \geq d/2$, we have $(d^2 - 8d + 40)(1/2) \leq 19$. It follows that $d \leq 7$. Hence

$d \in \{4, 5, 6, 7\}$. In each case, $(\dagger)$ gives us an upper bound $t_{\max}$ for t :

d	$t_{\max}$
4	3
5	3
6	4
7	4

The cases $d \in \{4, 5\}$ contradict $t \geq 4$. In case $d \in \{6, 7\}$, we have $t = 4$, which contradicts our assumption that $d \mid st$. Hence $s > 4$.

Now suppose that $s = 5$. Then $t \geq 5$, $t \geq 2d/5$, and $d(t + n) + (10 - 2d)n \leq 44$. Substituting $n = st/d = 5t/d$ and simplifying, we obtain:

$$t \leq 44d/(d^2 - 5d + 50).$$

This implies that $t < 5$: contradiction. Hence $s \geq 6$.

Since $n = st/d \geq s^2/d$, it follows from $(*)$ that:

$$d\left[\frac{s^2}{d}(s - 6) + s\right] + 10\frac{s^2}{d} \leq \frac{s}{3}(2s^2 - 6s + 7).$$

This implies that:

$$s(s - 6) + d + 10\frac{s}{d} \leq \frac{1}{3}(2s^2 - 6s + 7) \quad (**)$$

and in particular that:

$$s(s - 6) \leq \frac{1}{3}(2s^2 - 6s + 7).$$

It follows that $s \leq 12$. Hence $6 \leq s \leq 12$. If $s = 12$, $(**)$ implies that $d + 120/d \leq 2\frac{1}{3}$. This is absurd. In a similar manner, one may eliminate the cases where $6 \leq s \leq 11$. f

Theorem 12.2 (“A”) *Let $S, T \subset \mathbf{CP}^3$ be surfaces. Assume that S has only rational singularities. Assume that $\deg(S) \leq \deg(T)$. Assume that $S \cap T$ is set-theoretically a smooth curve C of degree d and genus g . Assume that $\text{Sing}(S) \cap \text{Sing}(T) = \emptyset$. Then $d \leq g + 3$.*

PROOF. Let $s = \deg(S)$, $t = \deg(T)$, $n = st/d$. Let $p_i = p_i(S, C)$. By (10.1 = “I”), we have:

$$p_1 = \cdots = p_{n-1} = \frac{1}{n-1} \{d[n(s-4) + t] + (2-2g)n\}.$$

We show that S has no singularities of type $D_{t,t}$ (with t odd, $t \geq 5$), lying on C . There are two cases. If $n = 2$, then $\text{order}(S, C) \mid 2$. But by (5.3), the order of $D_{t,t}$ (as above) is 4. Hence $n > 2$. Hence $p_1 = p_2$. But $p_1(D_{t,t}) > p_2(D_{t,t})$ (by 5.2), so “ $D_{t,t} \notin (S, C)$ ” for t odd, $t \geq 5$.

From this, it follows that $p_1 + \cdots + p_{n-1} \leq \Sigma(S, C)$. Let $r = d[n(s-4) + t] + (2-2g)n$. By (11.3), we conclude that $r \leq \frac{s}{3}(2s^2 - 6s + 7) - 1$.

The case $n = 1$ corresponds to a complete intersection, and the theorem is easily verified in this case. Therefore we may assume that $n \geq 2$. By [18], it follows that if $s \leq 3$, then $d \leq g + 3$. Hence we may assume that $s \geq 4$. Therefore (12.1) applies, and we conclude that $d \leq g + 3$. $\mathfrak{f}$

Corollary 12.3 *Let $S, T \subset \mathbf{CP}^3$ be surfaces. Assume that S and T have only rational singularities. Assume that $S \cap T$ is set-theoretically a smooth curve C of degree d and genus g . Assume that $\text{Sing}(S) \cap \text{Sing}(T) = \emptyset$. Then $d \leq g + 3$.*

13 Theorem X

As a corollary of theorem (I), we show:

Theorem 13.1 (“X”) *Let $C \subset \mathbf{P}^3$ be a smooth curve. Assume that C is not a complete intersection. Suppose that $C = S \cap T$ as sets, where $S, T \subset \mathbf{P}^3$ are surfaces. Assume that $\text{Sing}(S) \cap \text{Sing}(T) = \emptyset$. Then:*

$$\deg(S), \deg(T) < 2 \cdot \deg(C)^4.$$

First we make a few remarks.

- (1) The proof of theorem (X) depends primarily on the fact that the numbers p_k in theorem (I) must be integers.

- (2) The importance of theorem (X) is that an upper bound is given for the degrees of S and T , that this bound is computable, and that this bound depends only on the degree of C . In the proof, we give the better bounds $\deg(S) < 2 \cdot \deg(C)^2$, $\deg(T) < 2 \cdot \deg(C)^4$, provided that $\deg(S) \leq \deg(T)$.
- (3) Via the bounds in theorem (X), it becomes a computer triviality to find all possible degrees for S and T which are consistent with the integrality of the numbers p_k in theorem (I).
- (4) Doing this when $\deg(C) = 4$, $\text{genus}(C) = 0$, and assuming for efficiency that $\deg(S) \leq \deg(T)$, we find:

$$(\deg(S), \deg(T)) \in \{(3, 4), (3, 8), (4, 4), (4, 7), (6, 26), (9, 48), (10, 28), (12, 18), (13, 16), (17, 220), (18, 118), (19, 84), (20, 67), (22, 50), (28, 33)\}.$$

[We have excluded the cases where $\deg(S)$ is 1 or 2, which cannot occur.]

- (5) We do not know which of these pairs of integers can be realized by pairs of surfaces, as in theorem (X). All that we know is that $(3, 4)$ and $(3, 8)$ cannot be realized in characteristic zero, and that $(4, 4)$ can be realized in characteristic two.
- (6) Theorem (X) is false without the hypothesis that C is a complete intersection. Counterexample: for any $s \in \mathbf{N}$, one can find a smooth curve $D \subset \mathbf{P}^2$ of degree s and a line $L \subset \mathbf{P}^2$ such that $D \cap L$ is a single point, set-theoretically. Let S and T be cones over D and L , with the same vertex. Then $S \cap T$ is a line, set-theoretically. Theorem (X) is also false without the hypothesis that $\text{Sing}(S) \cap \text{Sing}(T) = \emptyset$.

Before proceeding with the proof of theorem (X), we need the following lemma, which was known in characteristic zero, and for the smooth case, was known in all characteristics. (See proof for references.)

Lemma 13.2 *Let $S \subset \mathbf{P}^3$ be a normal surface. Then $\text{Pic}(S)/\text{Pic}(\mathbf{P}^3)$ is torsion-free.*

Before proceeding with the proof, we recall some standard material on differentials for which we do not have a good reference. First of all, for any scheme X , there is a map of sheaves of abelian groups:

$$\mathrm{dlog} : \mathcal{O}_X^* \longrightarrow \Omega_X$$

given by $f \mapsto df/f$. (All sheaves we shall discuss are sheaves on the Zariski site.)

Now suppose that X is a normal proper variety, defined over an algebraically closed field k of positive characteristic p . Then we have an exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X^* \xrightarrow{F} \mathcal{O}_X^* \xrightarrow{\mathrm{dlog}} \Omega_X$$

of sheaves of abelian groups on X , where F denotes the Frobenius map. The exactness in the middle depends on normality, and may be deduced e.g. from ([16] I 4.2). Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the image of dlog . Since X is proper, $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X^*) = k^*$, so $H^0(X, F)$ is an isomorphism, and we obtain an isomorphism $H^0(X, \mathcal{D}) \cong \ker H^1(X, F)$. We have $\ker H^1(X, F) \cong {}_p\mathrm{Pic}(X)$. Composing with the canonical injection $H^0(X, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow H^0(X, \Omega_X)$, we obtain an injective group homomorphism:

$$\psi_X : {}_p\mathrm{Pic}(X) \longrightarrow H^0(X, \Omega_X).$$

PROOF (of 13.2). First we show (*) that $\mathrm{Pic}(S)/\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{P}^3)$ has no torsion, except possibly for p -torsion, when the ground field has positive characteristic p . These arguments are very similar to those given by Lang [21]. The methods were invented by Grothendieck ([10] Exposé XI), and further studied by Hartshorne ([13] §4.3). We refer the reader to [21] or [13] for details.

Let S_n be the n^{th} infinitesimal neighborhood of S in $\mathbf{P}^3$. Then:

$$\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{P}^3) \cong \varprojlim \mathrm{Pic}(S_n).$$

Moreover, for each n there is an exact sequence of abelian groups:

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Pic}(S_{n+1}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Pic}(S_n) \longrightarrow H^2(S, \mathcal{J}^n/\mathcal{J}^{n+1}),$$

where $\mathcal{J}$ is the ideal sheaf of S in $\mathbf{P}^3$. Since the H^2 term is a vector space, (*) follows.

From now on we may assume that the ground field has positive characteristic p . A standard calculation shows that $H^0(S, \Omega_S) = 0$. Up to now,

we have not used the hypothesis that S is normal. We now use this hypothesis. Via the map ψ_S , defined immediately above this proof, we see that ${}_p\text{Pic}(S) = 0$. (This argument is essentially that used in [21].)

Finally, to complete the proof, we must show that $[O_S(1)]$ does not have a p^{th} root in $\text{Pic}(S)$. The argument given here is essentially the argument given in ([4] 1.8). For any variety X , there is a natural group homomorphism $H^1(\text{dlog}) : \text{Pic}(X) \rightarrow H^1(X, \Omega_X)$. Consider this map when $X = S$ and when $X = \mathbf{P}^3$. A standard calculation shows that the map $H^1(\mathbf{P}^3, \Omega_{\mathbf{P}^3}) \rightarrow H^1(S, \Omega_S)$ is injective. Moreover, one knows that the image of $[O_{\mathbf{P}^3}(1)]$ in $H^1(\mathbf{P}^3, \Omega_{\mathbf{P}^3})$ is not zero. (See e.g. [14] Chapter 3, exercise 7.4.) Hence the image of $[O_S(1)]$ in $H^1(S, \Omega_S)$ is not zero. Hence $[O_S(1)]$ does not have a p^{th} root in $\text{Pic}(S)$. $\mathfrak{f}$

Remark 13.3 Over an algebraically closed field of positive characteristic, let $S \subset \mathbf{P}^3$ be a surface, not necessarily normal. We do not know if $\text{Pic}(S)/\text{Pic}(\mathbf{P}^3)$ is torsion-free, or even if $\text{Pic}(S)$ is torsion-free. Answers to these questions might be obtained from a general structure theorem for $\text{Ker}[\text{Pic}(S) \rightarrow \text{Pic}(S_{\text{nor}})]$, where S is an arbitrary projective variety.

Corollary 13.4 *In $\mathbf{P}^3$, suppose that $C = S \cap T$ as sets, where C is a curve, and S, T are surfaces. Assume that C does not meet $\text{Sing}(S)$. Then there exists a surface $T' \subset \mathbf{P}^3$ such that $C = S \cap T'$, scheme-theoretically.*

PROOF. Since $T \cap \text{Sing}(S) = \emptyset$, S is normal. By (13.2), $\text{Pic}(S)/\text{Pic}(\mathbf{P}^3)$ is torsion-free. Hence $[O_S(C)] = 0$ in $\text{Pic}(S)/\text{Pic}(\mathbf{P}^3)$. Hence $O_S(C) \cong O_S(t)$ for some $t \in \mathbf{N}$. Since the canonical map $H^0(\mathbf{P}^3, O_{\mathbf{P}^3}(t)) \rightarrow H^0(S, O_S(t))$ is surjective, it follows that there exists a surface T' of degree t as claimed. $\mathfrak{f}$

Remark 13.5 Robbiano [28] proved this in the case where S is smooth and the ground field has characteristic zero.

PROOF (of theorem X). Let $d = \deg(C)$, $g = \text{genus}(C)$, $s = \deg(S)$, $t = \deg(T)$. We may assume that $s \leq t$. We show that $s < 2d^2$ and $t < 2d^4$. Let $n = st/d$. By theorem (I), we know that:

$$(n-1) \mid \{d[n(s-4) + t] + (2-2g)n\}.$$

A proof of this fact, independent of (I), is given at the end of this paper. By (13.4), we know that C meets $\text{Sing}(S)$. Hence $p_1(S, C) > 0$. Hence the right hand side is positive. Write $d = d_s d_t$, where $d_s, d_t \in \mathbf{N}$, $d_s | s$, and $d_t | t$. Let $s_1 = s/d_s$, $t_1 = t/d_t$. Then $n = s_1 t_1$, so:

$$(s_1 t_1 - 1) | \{d[s_1 t_1 (d_s s_1 - 4) + d_t t_1] + (2 - 2g)s_1 t_1\}.$$

The right hand side is divisible by t_1 , and $\gcd(s_1 t_1 - 1, t_1) = 1$, so:

$$(s_1 t_1 - 1) | \{d[s_1 (d_s s_1 - 4) + d_t] + (2 - 2g)s_1\}. \quad (*)$$

Thus for some $k \in \mathbf{N}$, we have:

$$(s_1 t_1 - 1)k = d[s_1 (d_s s_1 - 4) + d_t] + (2 - 2g)s_1.$$

Reorganizing, we find:

$$(s_1 t_1 - 1)k = (dd_s)s_1^2 + (2 - 2g - 4d)s_1 + dd_t. \quad (**)$$

Now we have $t \geq s$, so $t_1 \geq (d_s/d_t)s_1$. Hence:

$$\left[s_1^2 \left(\frac{d_s}{d_t} \right) - 1 \right] k \leq (dd_s)s_1^2 + (2 - 2g - 4d)s_1 + dd_t.$$

It is conceivable that the left hand side of this inequality is negative. This will not effect the following argument. Suppose that $k \geq dd_t$. After a short calculation, one finds that $s_1 \leq dd_t/(2d + g - 1)$, and hence that $s \leq d^2/(2d + g - 1)$. This implies that $s < 2d^2$. Hence, in order to prove our assertion that $s < 2d^2$, we may assume that $k < dd_t$.

From (**) we obtain:

$$(dd_s)s_1^2 + (2 - 2g - 4d - t_1 k)s_1 + (k + dd_t) = 0.$$

Hence $s_1 | (k + dd_t)$. Hence $s_1 \leq k + dd_t$. Hence $s_1 < 2dd_t$. Hence $s < 2d^2$.

To complete the proof, we must show that $t < 2d^4$. The right hand side of (*) is nonzero, so:

$$s_1 t_1 - 1 \leq d[s_1 (d_s s_1 - 4) + d_t] + (2 - 2g)s_1.$$

Dividing by s_1 and isolating t_1 , we find:

$$t_1 \leq d[d_s s_1 - 4 + d_t s_1^{-1}] + 2 - 2g + s_1^{-1}.$$

Taking account of $t_1 = t d_t^{-1}$ and $s_1 = s d_s^{-1}$, we obtain:

$$t \leq d_t \{d[s - 4 + d s^{-1}] + 2 - 2g\} + d s^{-1}.$$

Since $s < 2d^2$, it follows (with a little work) that $t < 2d^4$. f

Remark 13.6 We give here an alternate proof of the main ingredient of the proof of (X), namely that

$$(n-1) \mid \{d[n(s-4)+t] + (2-2g)n\}. \quad (\dagger)$$

Let $\tilde{C}$ be the scheme-theoretic complete intersection of S and T . Let $\mathcal{J}$ be the ideal sheaf of C in $\tilde{C}$. Let p be a closed point of C . If $\mathcal{O}_{S,p}$ is regular, then near p , $\tilde{C}$ and C are Cartier divisors on S , with $\tilde{C} = nC$. Choose an isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_{S,p} \cong k[[x, y]]$, such that C corresponds to $V(x)$. Then $\tilde{C}$ corresponds to $V(x^n)$. Therefore the algebra of conormal invariants

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}/\mathcal{J} \oplus \mathcal{J}/\mathcal{J}^2 \oplus \mathcal{J}^2/\mathcal{J}^3 \oplus \dots$$

is a locally free $\mathcal{O}_C$ -module near p . But we similarly get the same conclusion if $\mathcal{O}_{T,p}$ is regular, so in fact $\mathcal{A}$ is locally free since $\text{Sing}(S) \cap \text{Sing}(T) = \emptyset$.

Moreover, there is a line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ on C such that $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathcal{O}_C \oplus \mathcal{L} \oplus \mathcal{L}^2 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{L}^{n-1}$. Hence $\chi(\mathcal{A}) = n(1-g) + \binom{n}{2} \deg(\mathcal{L})$. On the other hand, $\chi(\mathcal{A}) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}})$, which (via $\tilde{C} = S \cap T$) is easily computed to be $st(4-s-t)/2$. Hence

$$n(1-g) + \binom{n}{2} \deg(\mathcal{L}) = \frac{st(4-s-t)}{2}.$$

Hence

$$\binom{n}{2} \mid \frac{st(4-s-t)}{2} - n(1-g).$$

It is not difficult to verify that this is equivalent to $(\dagger)$.

References

- [1] Bott, R. and L. W. Tu
: *Differential Forms in Algebraic Topology*
, Springer-Verlag (New York), 1982
.

- [2] Brieskorn, E.: Die Auflösung der rationalen Singularitäten holomorpher Abbildungen, *Math. Ann.* **178** (1968), 255–270
.
- [3] Catanese, F.: Babbage’s conjecture, contact of surfaces, symmetric determinantal varieties and applications, *Invent. Math.* **63** (1981), 433–465
.
- [4] Deligne, P.
: Cohomologie des intersections complètes, exposé XI in *Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique* (SGA 7)
, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **340**, Springer-Verlag (New York), 1973, pp. 39–61
.
- [5] Eisenbud, D. and A. Van de Ven: On the normal bundles of smooth rational space curves, *Math. Ann.* **256** (1981), 453–463
.
- [6] Fossum, R. M.
: *The Divisor Class Group of a Krull Domain*
, Springer-Verlag (New York), 1973
.
- [7] Fulton, W.
: *Intersection Theory*
, Springer-Verlag (New York), 1984
.

- [8]

Gallarati, D.: Ricerche sul contatto di superfiche algebriche lungo curve,
Académie royale de Belgique, Classe des Sciences, Mémoires, Collection in-8⁰
32 (1960), 1–78

.
- [9]

Griffiths, P. and J. Harris
 : *Principles of Algebraic Geometry*
 , John Wiley & Sons (New York), 1978

.
- [10]

Grothendieck, A.
 : Cohomologie Locale des Faisceaux Coherents et Theorems de Lefschetz
 Locaux et Globaux, in *Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique* (SGA 2)
 , North-Holland, 1968

.
- [11]

Grothendieck, A. and J. A. Dieudonné: Eléments de géométrie algébrique
 II, *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*
8 (1961)

.
- [12]

———: Eléments de géométrie algébrique IV (part four), *Inst. Hautes
 Études Sci. Publ. Math.*
32 (1967)

.
- [13]

Hartshorne, R.
 : *Ample Subvarieties of Algebraic Varieties*
 , Lecture Notes in Mathematics **156**, Springer-Verlag (New York), 1970

.

[14]

: *Algebraic Geometry*
, Springer-Verlag (New York), 1977

.

[15]

_____: Complete intersections in characteristic $p > 0$, *Amer. J. Math.*
101 (1979), 380–383

.

[16]

Iversen, B.
: *Generic Local Structure in Commutative Algebra*
, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **310**, Springer-Verlag (New York), 1973

.

[17]

Jaffe, D. B.: Space curves which are the intersection of a cone with another
surface, *Duke Math. J.*
57 (1988), 859–876

.

[18]

_____: On set theoretic complete intersections in $\mathbf{P}^3$, *Math. Ann.*
285 (1989), 165–173, 175, 174, 176

.

[19]

_____: Smooth curves on a cone which pass through its vertex, *Manu-
scripta Math.*
73 (1991), 187–205

.

[20]

_____: Local geometry of smooth curves passing through rational double
points, *Math. Ann.*
294 (1992), 645–660

.

- [21]

Lang, W. E.: Remarks on p -torsion of algebraic surfaces, *Compositio Math.*
52 (1984), 197–202

.
- [22]

Lipman, J.: Rational singularities, with applications to algebraic surfaces
 and unique factorization, *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*
36 (1969), 195–279

.
- [23]

Matsumura, H.
 : *Commutative Algebra, second edition*
 , Benjamin/Cummings (Reading, Massachusetts), 1980

.
- [24]

Miyaoka, Y.: The maximal number of quotient singularities on surfaces
 with given numerical invariants, *Math. Ann.*
268 (1984), 159–171

.
- [25]

Morrison, D. R.: The birational geometry of surfaces with rational double
 points, *Math. Ann.*
271 (1985), 415–438

.
- [26]

Mumford, D.: The topology of normal singularities of an algebraic surface
 and a criterion for simplicity, *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*
9 (1961), 229–246

.
- [27]

Rao, A. P.: On self-linked curves, *Duke Math. J.*
49 (1982), 251–273

.

- [28] Robbiano, L.: A problem of complete intersections, *Nagoya Math. J.* **52** (1973), 129–132
.
- [29] Sakai, F.: Weil divisors on normal surfaces, *Duke Math. J.* **51** (1984), 877–887
.
- [30] Samuel, M. P.
: Handwritten notes (one page), July 1964.